

APR 9 1921

Volume XXXVI

APRIL, 1921

Number 4

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GENERAL LIBRARY

APR - 9 1921

UNIV. OF MICH.

## CONTENTS

FRANK, GRACE.—Critical Notes on the 'Palatine Passion,'	193
HOHLFELD, A. R.—The Poems in Carlyle's Translation of 'Wilhelm Meister,'	205
EMERSON, O. F.—Two Notes on 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight,'	212
DAVIDSON, L. J.—Forerunners of Goldsmith's 'The Citizen of the World,'	215
GODDARD, EUNICE R.—Color in Lamartine's 'Jocelyn,'	221
SCHAFER, AARON.—The Sources of Théodore de Banville's 'Gringoire,'	225

### Reviews:—

GORDON HALL GEROULD, Saints' Legends. [George L. Hamilton.]	230
KENNETH HAYENS, Theodor Fontane. A Critical Study. [F. Schoenemann.]	242
SHIRLEY G. PATTERSON, <i>L'Etat de Guerre</i> and <i>Projet de Paix Perpétuelle</i> , two essays by J.-J. Rousseau. [Albert Schinz.]	245

### Correspondence:—

HAYENS, RAYMOND D.—Aaron Hill's Poem on Blank Verse,	247
MERRILL, L. R.—George Herbert's <i>Church Porch</i> ,	249
HAMMOND, ELEANOR P.—The Texts of Lydgate's <i>Danse Macabre</i> ,	250
BUSH, J. D.—A Note on <i>Beowulf</i> 1600-1605,	251

### Brief Mention:—

ARTHUR G. KENNEDY, The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination,	252
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

**A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-  
mission from July to October (inclusive)**

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is  
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25  
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

## New Oxford Books in Italian

Ferrari, Goldoni e le sue Sèdici Commèdie Nuove. 1920. Fcap 8vo ( $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. 139.

de Sanctis, Due Saggi Critici: Giuseppe Parini. Ugo Foscolo. 1920. Fcap 8vo ( $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. 79.

Two volumes in a new series of Italian Plain Texts under the general editorship of Professor Foligno, Serena Professor of Italian in the University of Oxford.

Ferrari, Goldoni e le sue Sèdici Commèdie Nuove. Edited with preface and notes by ARUNDELL DEL RE. 1920. Fcap 8vo ( $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. viii + 156.

de Sanctis, Due Saggi Critici: Giuseppe Parini. Ugo Foscolo. Edited with introduction and notes by PIERO REBORA. 1920. Fcap 8vo ( $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. vii + 90.

Annotated editions with English introductions, bibliographies and notes to both of the Oxford Italian Plain texts listed above.

*Copies of the above for examination with  
a view to class use may be had on request*



**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**  
*American Branch*

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVI

APRIL, 1921

NUMBER 4

## CRITICAL NOTES ON THE *PALATINE PASSION*

Students of the mediæval drama have not failed to recognize the importance of Dr. Karl Christ's discovery of the oldest known French Passion play among a mass of neglected manuscripts in the Palatine collections of the Vatican. His edition of the text which now appears in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XL, 405-488, is accordingly most welcome.

The difficulties incident to the publication of a unique manuscript have been increased in the present instance by the fact that almost all rubrics are wanting in the text, so that the division of the lines into speeches and the ascription of such speeches to the proper speakers are often matters of pure conjecture. Dr. Christ has displayed excellent judgment in solving most of the problems involved, and his edition presents a very readable text of the play. His brief but well-chosen notes on its literary and linguistic aspects serve as an admirable introduction. He is especially to be commended for printing the manuscript practically as it stands, indicating the expansion of abbreviations by italics,<sup>1</sup> introducing comparatively few emendations, and resisting all temptations to "regularize" the rhythm and the rhymes. He puts into parentheses lines, words, and sounds which he conceives to be uninspired additions to the text, and although his conclusions in these matters may not always satisfy his readers, it is in any case far better that a manuscript not readily consulted should thus be presented in its

<sup>1</sup> The wisdom of expanding *mlt* by *molt* may well be questioned since the unabbreviated form throughout is *mout* (once *mont*, 1546), never *molt*.

first edition in an unmutated form than distorted by editorial interference.

This is the more important for the *Palatine Passion* because the work itself is composite in character, and linguistic consistency cannot justifiably be demanded of it. Unfortunately, the two Paris manuscripts of the so-called *Passion d'Autun*, which are related to the *Palatine Passion*, were inaccessible to Dr. Christ because of the war, and the old narrative poem—the *Passion des Jongleurs*—upon which much of it is based was unknown to him in its original form. Accordingly, the editor, although vaguely aware of the commingling of older and newer elements in the play (see pp. 408, 409 note 1, 423) was not in a position to differentiate between them by means of objective criteria.

A comparison <sup>2</sup> of the play, however, with the texts related to it has established the fact, I think, that the oldest stratum comprises the passages which derive from the narrative poem, that a later stage is represented by the lines which correspond to lines in the *Passion d'Autun*, and that, finally, those revisions and additions which distinguish the *Palatine Passion* from the other texts—in a general way, the stanzaic forms, the "humorous" incidents, and certain conventional scenes in which omissions and rearrangement can be detected—are to be attributed to its latest redactors. How completely all these elements may have been fused by the final revisor cannot be ascertained, but since Dr. Christ has studied the language of the play without attempting to distinguish the strata underlying it, it may be worth while to assemble the available evidence, such as it is.

1. Versification. (a) The greater part of the *Palatine Passion* is written in octosyllabic couplets. The presence of stanzaic forms,<sup>3</sup> however, distinguishes it from the old narrative poem, from the Sion fragment published by M. Bédier (*Romania* xxiv, 86), and from the two versions of the *Passion d'Autun*. Since these stanzaic forms occur in precisely those parts of the play for which the other texts offer no parallels,<sup>4</sup> we may safely assume that they are

<sup>2</sup> See *Publications of the Modern Language Association* xxxv, 464-83, and *Modern Language Notes* xxxv, 257-69. Through the kindness of M. Lucien Foulet I was able to obtain photographs of the two Paris manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> Stanzaic structure is more frequent than Dr. Christ indicates (pp. 415-6). Cf. *P. M. L. A.* xxxv, 478, note 24.

<sup>4</sup> A few lines in the *Planctus Mariae* and St. John's reply (1089, 1094-8,



late additions in our text. (b) As Dr. Christ points out (p. 416), most of the individual speeches in the *Palatine Passion* end with a completed rhyme, a fact that would lead one to think that in the north, as in the south, the so-called mnemonic scheme of connecting succeeding speeches by rhyme did not originally prevail. Speeches unconnected by rhyme occur in every stratum of the text, in the latest additions as well as in the older parts. There are, however, some thirty-three instances (excluding single lines) where the last line of one speech rhymes with the first line of the succeeding speech, and these instances seem to be relatively more frequent in those parts of the play that have been most recently added: the dialogue between the three Maries and the Spice-merchant, the scenes in Hell, and the scenes between Cayn and Huitacelin, including the casting of the lots. It would be hazardous to assert, however, that a later redactor, or later redactors, having learned or formulated a new rule, proceeded to put it into practice in this text: the division of the rhymes when it occurs seems to arise from an increased freedom in technique (or from chance) rather than from the conscious application of a rule.

2. Elision. The *e* of unaccented monosyllables, as well as the final atonic *e* in polysyllables, is sometimes elided, sometimes not, before a word beginning with a vowel. Examples of the non-elision of *e* in atonic monosyllables are fairly numerous, but seem to occur only in the couplets (some thirty-seven examples) and in the stanzas rhyming *aaa<sup>b</sup>b<sup>a</sup>* (three examples). Instances of the non-elision of final atonic *e* in polysyllables occur in every part of the text.

3. Hiatus. In general, pretonic vowels, whether initial or non-initial, and post-tonic *e*, when standing in hiatus with a stressed vowel, retain their syllabic value. The exceptions noted,<sup>5</sup> as well

1131-9, 1220-5; note that ll. 1116 ff. belong to St. John, not Marie Magdelaine) are reminiscent of lines in Bib. Nat. n. a. fr. 4085 but that they have been adapted to the stanzaic structure is obvious.

<sup>5</sup>Christ, *loc. cit.* p. 417. Many of the "exceptions" occur elsewhere in their older forms, e. g. pretonic *e* is not syllabic in *veoir*, 1208, 1886, but cf. ll. 483, 1731, 1884 where it is; cf. *preeschemens*, 1043 with *preëscha*, 239; cf. *beneoite*, 837 with *beneïte*, 860, etc. Christ does not observe that in the case of *veez* it is only the imperative which is monosyllabic; cf. also *asseez*, 909 and probably *creez*, 533, although the imperative *creez* is disyllabic in 305 and 521.

as the examples of non-syllabic inter-consonantal pretonic *ə*, seem to be due to late redactors, that is, they occur in those parts of the play for which the associated texts furnish no parallels. Most of them are in the stanzas or in episodes unknown to the other texts. A few which appear in lines that are related to lines in these texts are obviously editorial: for *renvoierez*, l. 412, n. a. fr. 4085 has *retournes* (note that *envoierai*, 434, has the usual four syllables); and for *essuierai*, 91, n. a. fr. 4085 and 4356 both have *paneray*. The prevalence of the older forms, however, even in the latest additions to the text, indicates that its final redaction occurred before these forms had to any extent been displaced.

4. Phonetics. The rhyme *eus : savoureux*, 1082-3 and the assonance *deul : pleur*, 1094-5, testify to the fact that the later pronunciation of stressed free *ø* (ö) had come into use before the text, as we have it, was complete. It may be noteworthy, however, that these two (unique)<sup>6</sup> instances both occur in an elaborate stanzaic Planctus which is probably a late addition to the text. On the other hand, the older pronunciation is seemingly<sup>7</sup> attested in the following rhymes: *preuz : touz*, 173-4; *jours : seigneurs*, 860-1; *menour : entour*, 929-30; *jour : greigneur : traïtour : douleur*, 1145-8; *seigneur : amour : douleur : couleur*, 1176-9; *doulour : amour*, 1718-9. It seems not unlikely therefore that most of the text was written before the change *ø > ö* occurred.<sup>8</sup>

5. Morphology. The two-case declension of nouns and adjectives was apparently observed until a very recent stage in the

<sup>6</sup>The assonance (?) *l(i)eu(<ö) : jour*, 1870-1 (cf. Christ, *loc. cit.* p. 418) in the (late) Epicier's harangue can hardly be in question.

<sup>7</sup>There is of course much uncertainty concerning this question, and one cannot be dogmatic. It has merely seemed significant that the later pronunciation is attested by rhyme only twice—and in a recent addition to the text. (On the identification of *-our* and *-eur* in the fifteenth century and even earlier, see E. Langlois, *Recueil d'Arts de seconde rhétorique*, Paris, 1902, xlv; III, 154; IV, 209, and H. Chatelain, *Recherches sur le vers français au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1908, pp. 39-41, 231.)

<sup>8</sup>Christ (p. 418) emphasizes the prevalence of the representation of *ø* by *eu* (*-osus* by *-eus*, *-orem* by *-eur*) in the manuscript, but pronunciation, not spelling, concerns us here. At the rhyme-end, however, even the scribe is relatively conservative: *ø* is represented by *ou* or *o* twenty times, by *eu* twenty times,—the ratio of *eu* to *ou* or *o* in the body of the text is much higher.

development of the text had been reached. In the rhymes, the older forms, often attested, are almost universal, and in several cases where newer forms appear the rhymes may be recovered by merely substituting the earlier forms in their place.<sup>9</sup> In a few instances,<sup>10</sup> however, later forms are seemingly required by the rhymes, and since they do not occur in the oldest parts of the text, they are probably to be attributed to editorial or scribal revision.

Adjectives of the type *grant* have in general but one form in the masculine and feminine. The feminine *tel* occurs seven times, and of the eleven instances where the scribe writes *tele*, *tel* is required by the rhythm in at least six, possibly more.<sup>11</sup> The certain instances of *tele* can be quite surely ascribed to later strata of the text. The feminine *quel* appears in l. 1739 and originally occurred in ll. 989 and 1726,<sup>12</sup> where the manuscript has *quele*. Only the older forms appear in the feminine plural (289, 1993). In two of the later metrical Complaints, however, we find *cruere* in rhyme twice (1152, 1220), beside *cruel* (1143).<sup>13</sup>

\* Older forms, as shown by the rhymes, originally occurred in ll. 303, 615, 1399 (the ms. reads *sauf*), 1603, 1664, 1677, 1690, 1735, as well as in ll. 292, 978, 1115 (Christ has emended here), and 1966, since *-s* and *-z* are not differentiated in the rhymes. Older forms may have been present (since the rhymes would not be destroyed thereby) in ll. 666-7, 913-4, 1259-60, 1291-2. For syntactical reasons one may read *delivere[z]* : *nez*, 1449-50 and *avenus(z)* : *venus(z)*, 1655-6 (Foulet, *Petite Syntaxe*, §§ 115-7). The plural may have replaced the singular in 684 where O. F. P. has the plural.

<sup>9</sup> In ll. 273, 1011, 1090, 1108, and probably 1574 (cf. *druz*, 569).

<sup>11</sup> *Tel* is written: 823, 836, 950, 1033, 1148, 1208, 1846. *Tele* is written but *tel* required: 859, 1806 (this line should be octosyllabic, see note to 1805-8), 1893 (see note to this line); and (before a vowel) 294, 1516, 1889. *Tele* is written and possibly required (emendations, or the assumption of hiatus, seem plausible in some cases): 270 (the preceding lines derive from O. F. P., these do not), 1085 (stanzaic Planctus), 1741 (the passage is in both the Sion fragment and n. a. fr. 4085, but this line does not appear in either), 1976, 1991 (though possibly one should read *tel(e)* here; 1976 and 1991 do not belong to the earliest strata of the text in all probability).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the Sion fragment, l. 28 and Sneyders de Vogel, *Neophilologus* (1917), III, 9.

<sup>13</sup> *Dolente* is of course as old as the oldest documents (Schwan-Behrens, *Grammatik*, § 306). Dr. Christ cites as "isoliert" a few cases of the more modern nominative forms of the unstressed masculine possessive pronouns. The statistics are: *mon*, 2, *ton*, 4, *son*, 1; *mes*, 5, *ses*, 1. In the plural only *mi* and *si* occur (11 instances). The more modern nominative forms of the article are also less infrequent than he assumes (p. 422): *le* and *les*

The results of these tests for stratification, unsatisfactory as they may be when considered individually, seem nevertheless when viewed as a whole to yield some information concerning the date of the play. They point to the lapse of some time between the first and the final redactions, and of at least a short period<sup>14</sup> between the later redactions and the scribe of our manuscript. If, with Dr. Christ, we place the transcription of the manuscript in the first part of the fourteenth century we may conveniently date the work of the later redactors toward the beginning of that century, and we need therefore feel small hesitancy in assuming that the earlier strata of the play were written in the thirteenth century.<sup>15</sup>

The conjecture that dramatic representations of the Passion of Christ, written in French, took place before the fourteenth century is accordingly confirmed.<sup>16</sup> How much of the *Palatine Passion* may have been played thus early? *A priori* hypotheses concerning what should constitute an archaic Passion play have assumed that grotesque, humorous and gruesome elements would be wanting, and that characters unnamed in the Gospels would not appear.<sup>17</sup> If we except the scenes of the forging of the nails and the boasting of the knights, these assumptions are proved correct. The bargain of Judas and the casting of the lots, in their present form, the *supplices* of the scourging and Crucifixion, the *diablerie*, the spice-merchant's harangue, the names of the servants, torturers, executioners—Cayn, Huitacelin, Joel, Mossé, Haquin and Evramin—as well as the stanzaic portions of the text are probably all due to redactors.

The following suggestions—emendations, corrections, additions—are offered for what they may be worth in a second edition of the play.<sup>18</sup>

occur 10 and 3 times, respectively, *li*, singular, and *li*, plural, occur 56 and 37 times, respectively.

<sup>14</sup> Long enough for the two-case declension to have disintegrated further and for the representation of stressed *o* by *eu* to have become more general.

<sup>15</sup> A *terminus a quo* is furnished by the old narrative Passion, written "at the close of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century," see F. A. Foster, *The Northern Passion*, E. E. T. S. 147, p. 49.

<sup>16</sup> Jeanroy, *Journal des Savants*, n. s. iv (1906), 480.

<sup>17</sup> Jeanroy, *loc. cit.* pp. 482-3.

<sup>18</sup> Abbreviations used: 1) MSS. Bibliothèque Nationale, n. a. fr. 4085 and

Line 59. Read *se(r)ans* for *seraus* (cf. 64, 704, 1351). *U*, *n*, and *v* seldom are clearly differentiated in the manuscript, and the epenthetic *r* may result from the peculiar treatment of *r* in the text; on rhymes in which *r* is disregarded and on spellings in which *r* replaces *n* and *l* see Christ, *loc. cit.* 420; on *paller* and *Pylatre* see notes to ll. 327 and 439, below. The derivation of *seraus*, a hitherto unknown adverb, from *serau*, *serault* (p. 476) is unconvincing.—71. Read *saien[s]* *seront*.—78. Cf. the variant readings of O. F. P. 188: Tant que soie de mort resours; 4085, fol. 146 r: Jusque de mort relevera; and 4356, fol. 3 v: Tant que de mors relevé seray.—93. Cf. 4085, fol. 146 r:

Bien sce(t) que il ly plairay  
Et de mes pechés pardon aray,

and 4356, fol. 4 r:

Bien scai que quan il me vera  
Mes pechiés me pardonera.

103, 108. Substituting *ijj* for the ms. reading *iii* destroys the rhythm. Cf. O. F. P. 92 (GOPQVO'): Il valoit bien *ijj* c deniers.—115. The source of this line (O. F. P. 105) reads: Mais longuement ne m'avrés mie (*Matthew* xxvi, 11).—142. The ms. reads *Q'* (= *Que*) which should be preserved. Cf. L. Foulet, *Petite Syntaxe de l'ancien français*, § 184.—143-4. Should be assigned to *S. Pierre*, as in 4085 and 4356.—155. Why change the ms. reading *a* to *o*?—159. Read *Ci* (paleographically possible) *ne ving* for *Qui ne vint*. Sic O. F. P. 253, C. *Presentie* is probably *presomptie* (cf. the spellings *preson.*, *presumcie*, *presencious* in Godefroy's examples). Christ's interpretation seems to assume *presentie* = *pressentiment*.—161. Read *jus* for *sus*, and cf. O. F. P. 256. Read also *m'envoia*: the scribal vagaries in this verb are not humored in ll. 590 (ms: *men voie*), 876 (ms: *mē voie*), etc.—181. This line should not be bracketed. Cf. O. F. P. 427 ff.

210. Here and 919 read *Enpreu*, not *En pren*. Cf. Godefroy, s. v. *Empreu*, Cotgrave, s. v. *Empreut*, and G. Paris in *Romania* xvii, 100.—239. Read *preëscha* for *preescha*.—254. This line may possibly have been spoken by *Uns Iuis*, *Si* being equivalent to *Cil*, as often in this text.—288. This line should probably be attributed to *Cayfas*.

300. The ms. reads: *q̃* (= *que*).—327. In the stage direction following, delete [*r*] in *pa[r]le*. Cf. 749, 841. These examples should have been included in the second section 11, p. 420. (The first 11 is a misprint for 10.)—340. Bracket (*Que*). Cf. O. F. P. 772.—346. Cf. O. F. P. 785-6:

n. a. fr. 4356 are cited as 4085 and 4356, respectively. 2) Excerpts from the *Old French Passion*, or *Passion des Jongleurs*, cited as O. F. P. are from H. Theben's edition (*Die altfr. Achtsilbnerredaction der Passion*, Greifswald, 1909—continued by E. Pfuhl, *Die weitere Fassung*, etc., Greifswald, 1909) with variants from the mss. used by him and from O' = F. A. Foster's edition in *The Northern Passion*, Early English Text Society 147 (1916), pp. 102 ff. 3) The *Passion de Semur* (published by Roy, *Le mystère de la Passion*, pp. 73\* ff.) is cited as Semur, or Sem.



Il meismes s'est bien jugiés,  
Or s'est il dou tout empiriés.

*Emperiez* is from the verb *empirier*, *emperier* (see Godef. Compl.). Correct Christ's note and vocabulary, and insert commas after *jugiez* and *prevoz*.—351. Keep the ms. reading and cf. O. F. P. 883.—370. Read *parle[r]*.—373. Read *Dire ai oi* with O. F. P. 899, DSO'.—398. The space in the ms. hardly admits the reading *nous*. Read *le?* Cf. 4085 fol. 154 v: *Devenes tost apertement / Ou tu en aras bien aultrement*.

402. Indented in the ms. Possibly dramatic, as Christ interprets, but, since the line is indented, rhymeless, and lacks a syllable, more probably a stage direction: *Parole n'a parolé*.—409-31. It seems probable, from l. 435, that Annas spoke all these lines.—418. Probably *P* (= *Par*) not *P'* (= *Pour*) is omitted. Cf. 589, 680, 733. *P'* does not occur elsewhere in the ms.—422. The ms. reads *alumés*, not *ralumés*.—439. The ms. reads *Pylatre*. Cf. note to l. 59, *supra*.—450. Bracket (*salve et*).—456-9. Cf. O. F. P. 807-9:

Or voit Judas qu'il est dampnés  
Et ses sires a mort livrés  
Par lui et par sa traïson.

491. Keep the ms. reading.—499-500. Read *m'atendez* for *m'entendez*. Cf. 4085, fol. 151 r: *Or m'atant tanque reviendra / Et le fait je te contera*.

507. Read: *Quant [sui] eschapé, moy e[s]t bel*. The source is *Mark* xiv, 51-2 on which see Roy, *op. cit.* 223. Cf. O. F. P. 576-7:

Fuiant s'en va; moult li fu bel  
Quant de lor mains fu escapés.

and 4356, fol. 10 v:

Quar suis echapé, bien me vet.

517 ff. On the identity of those to whom Peter denied Jesus, see Duriez, *La Théologie dans le drame religieux* (Lille and Paris, 1914), p. 386. The scene in *Pal.* is a mosaic of lines taken from O. F. P. In 4356 *Aquin* puts the question the first and third time, *Malchus* the second. In 4085 *un Juif* addresses Peter twice, *la chambetiere* the third time.—543. ms. cō. Read *com[e]*.—545. According to Dr. D. S. Blondheim, to whom I am indebted for many helpful suggestions regarding the text, some of the Jews in the play bear contemporaneous Jewish names: *Haquin* = *Isaac*, *Mossé* = *Moses*, *Evramin* = *Abraham*. *Huitacelin* may be a diminutive of *Eutace*.—574. Read *ne[l]*?—575. Read *s'ai je for sai, j'é*.—593. Read *dites* for *dire* and place a period after *bel*.

602. The unscriptural position of the Casting of the Lots is peculiar to this play.—605. Delete comma after *tu*.—617. ms: *Aussit*. I should delete the *t* in 616 and the comma after *Aussit*, and place a colon after *deviserai*.—619. Read with the ms: *que [li] miez*. (Cayn is trying to persuade *Huitacelin*.)—620-1. Read (*me*) rather than (*Et*) and place a period after *remaiogne*. *Si que* = *cil qui*.—631 ff. Surely a new speech begins with 631. I should assign 631-4 to *Huitacelin*, 635-6 to *Cayn*, 637-41 to *Huita*, 642-53 to *Cayn*.—634. Read: *Aussi estoit ele a mi*. The Picard forms of the

pronoun are freely attested by the rhymes, and the rhyme *ie:i* occurs in ll. 1191-4. Cf. Christ, p. 418.—635-7. Note the change in the gender of the *los*; cf. 630-2.—648. Read *me tien* and delete the statement (p. 422) regarding the "unusual" form *metien*.—664. Read *Ie n'oi* and keep *ne*.—699-700. Bracket (*tu*), 699 and supply [*tout*] before *apertement*, 700.

701. It is apparent from O. F. P. 1066 ff. and 4085, 156 v, that there is an omission after this line.—720-5. In 4085 *Li Juis tous a ung oris* speak these words.—729. Read *Sanglente* (agreeing with *char*); this is hardly an instance of neglected rhyme, as stated on p. 418.—742-7. These lines probably belong to *Joel*, ll. 748 ff. being Pilate's rejoinder.—776. The original probably read *Qu'en*. *Suer* must be dissyllabic.—795. *Reenclees*, which Ch. annotates (p. 480) as "wohl für reeler, nřz. rēler," is from *draoncler*, *raoncler*, *raancler* (cf. Godefroy: *suppurer*, *apostumer*, and New Eng. Dict. s. v. *rankle*).

822. Meaning of *getees*? Dr. Blondheim suggests reading *ge[r]cees*.—830. MS: *cloficher*.—897. *Marmitaine*, which Ch. translates as *Murmeltier*, is probably related to *marmite*, *marmiteus*, in the expressions *faire le marmite* (= *faire le bon apôtre*, *l'hypocrite*, cf. Godefroy, s. v. *marmite* (3) and Littré, s. v. *marmiteux*), *faire le marmiteus* (= *l'affligé*, etc. See Godefroy's examples s. v. *marmiteus*, and especially Greban's *Passion*, l. 19392).—919. Cf. above, note to l. 210.—937. For *li ren si* read *li reus i*. An extra syllable is needed and examples of *ren*, masculine, in this meaning are rare. *Reus* (coupable, accusé) supplies the requirements of sense and rhythm, and is paleographically as likely as *ren*.—945-6. These unusual accusations do not occur in other early plays. In Sem. 7415, one of the Jews exclaims: *Quel confesserres de beguygues!*—947-52. On the analogy of Sem. 7462-5 and because of l. 953 these lines are probably to be attributed to Caiaphas. *Ung Juifz* speaks them in 4085. They derive from O. F. P. 1459-64.—959. The editor writes this name variously as Pilates, Pylates and Pilatus (348, 1469).—990-1. Cf. O. F. P. 1439-40 and variants. Mss. PV read: "Mere," fait il, "pour ce pent chi / Qu'esgarde la voie ainsi."—996-7. Cf. O. F. P. (GP) 1445-6:

Vois ci Jehan en leu de moi  
Comme fils soit ensemble o toi.

1002. Bracket (*je*). O. F. P. 1453 reads: *Sire, je ferai ton plaisir*.—1007. Keep the MS. reading: *done* (imperative, second person singular). Examples of the non-elsion of final atonic *e* in both monosyllables and polysyllables are numerous (see p. — *supra*), as the editor admits, pp. 416-7, but his emendations occasionally obscure them.—1014. *Ausi* is of course *aisi*, *aisil*, English *eisel*. The two drinks (*Matt.* xxvii, 34, *Mark* xv, 23 and *Matt.* xxvii, 48, *Mark* xv, 36, *John* xix, 29) are variously combined in the plays. Cf. the *Arras Passion* (ed. J.-M. Richard), 17310, and Greban's *Passion* 25936-7. The variants of O. F. P. 1529 include *suie et fiel*, *mierre et essil*, *vinaigre pyment et suye*, and *lexive*. On *aluine* see Tobler, *Altfr. Wörterb.* which cites Gl. Glasb. 157 b: "hoc aloë : aloine."—1019-35. These lines are probably all to be attributed to the same speaker, as in

4085 and 4356, where a nameless Jew (*Matt. xxvii, 47*) speaks them.—1044 ff. Dr. Christ's references should include *The Legend of Longinus* by R. J. Peebles, *Bryn Mawr Monograph Series*, ix, 1911.—1046. ms: *errant*.—1052. ms: *ses* (= *ces*). Supply [*je*] ?—1056. ms: *Pardonez*.—1071 ff. This Planctus seems to exhibit stanzaic structure to l. 1088. From there to 1115 it continues in couplets but with lines of varying lengths: aabb', 1088-95; aabb', 1096-9; aa'bb', 1100-3; aa'bb', 1104-7; aa'bb', 1108-12; aa'bb', 1113-5. I should therefore insert [*moi*], 1092; and bracket the second (*se je*), 1095 (*me*), 1099, and (*des*) *sevrée*, 1105.

1116-1209. This entire Planctus belongs to S. Jehan, the rubric after 1195 being a scribal error. Not only are the corresponding lines in 4085 spoken by St. John, but the masculine *las* (always *lasse* in the complaints of the Maries) occurs in ll. 1169, 1182, 1189.—1124-5. Read *Veioies* for *Veez* [*ci*], 1124. In 1125 the ms. reads *souffrir*.—1158. Read *sa* for *la*?—1173-4. I should place a comma after 1172 and read:

Que vous tant de bien n'i avez  
Ou vostre chief mettre puissiez.

These lines, like 1534-5, seem to be a reference to *Luke ix, 58*: *Filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet*. On the connection of this verse with the story of the Passion, see F. A. Foster, *The Northern Passion*, E. E. T. S. 147, p. 67. To Miss Foster's notes on *Corpus Christi College*, Cambridge, ms. 405, p. 375, I am indebted for these lines:

En la croiz pendeit,  
E la ne pout trover  
Sun chef ov reposer,  
Taunt fu mené (?) estreit.

1181-2. I read the ms. *nūtant* (= *nun tant*, i. e. *nec unus tantum*) and punctuate: period after 1180, comma after *Dame*, and exclamation point after 1181. Supply [*felon*] after *li*, 1182.—1195-6. Bracket (*Saint Jehan*). See above, note to 1116-1209.

1215-6. Read *oij*, 1215. In 1216 the ms. reading may be kept. Cf. *Mark xv, 34*, and with *encoy nonne* compare Godefroy's examples of *anquenuit*, as well as of *enqui*.—1227-8. This is evidently but one line. Bracket (*vous*) and (*que est fait*).—1242. Read: *Mout po li a duré s'honneur*. Elsewhere in the text the unstressed feminine possessive pronouns always elide their *a* before a vowel. The later forms do not occur.—1250. ms. *deable*.—1255. Read: *En prit, que il i avoit raison*.—1279 ff. The stanzaic structure probably precludes the exclusion of 1281, 1299 and the assumption of a lacuna after 1291. I should replace the interrogation point, 1283, with a comma and put an exclamation point after 1281. The present reading misses the force of the imperfect subjunctive in *feit*, 1283. It may be that originally 1283-7 were assigned to *Primus Diabolus*, and one should read *me* for *te*, 1283.

1313 ff. With this catalog of those in Hell, cf. *L'Evangile de Nicodème* (S. A. T. F. 1885), p. 110; the *Old French Passion* (Pfuhl's edition), 1621 ff., and Karl Pearson, *The Chances of Death*, (London, 1897) ii, 341.

—1348. Read with the MS: *a la bell'oe* (<auca). *Besloi* is masculine, and the stanzaic scheme is abab abab.—1354. Read *de* for *ne*?—1357. MS: *sosfler*. In 1381 also the MS. reads: *sousflerai*.—1373-6. These lines are troublesome and might well have been discussed in the notes.—*Aprochait* (which Ch. seems to assume is the third person perfect, cf. p. 417) should be subjunctive (after *avant que*), and is perhaps an example of the south-eastern form (see Schwan-Behrens, § 353 A, and on the identification of *oi* and *ai* in the text, Ch., 419). I suggest keeping nearer the MS. in 1376:

Avant que il de nous aprochait,  
Quar espoir il se cach[er]a(t).

The rhyme *ai : a* is of course frequent in the text. It is possible that 1373 ff. may have been spoken by *Secundus Diabolus*.—1379 ff. This speech probably belongs to *Primus Diabolus* (Satan) whose bold stand is throughout contrasted with the timidity of *Secundus Diabolus* (Enfer). Cf. M. J. Rudwin, *Der Teufel in den deut. geistl. Spielen* (Hesperia, VI), 114 ff.—1387, 1390. In 1387, bracket (*Vous*). In 1390 I read the MS: *deité*, not *dette*, which satisfies the sense and the meter.—1399. The MS. reads: *sauf*.

1396-1410. It is more likely that these lines are to be divided between *Jhesus* and *Primus Diabolus*, perhaps as follows: 1396, 1398-9, 1402-5, 1410 to be spoken by *Jhesus*; 1397, 1400-1, 1406-9, by *Primus Diabolus*. *Lerres mortaus* surely refers to Jesus and 1408-9 are more apposite in the mouth of Satan. Cf. the *Alsfelder Passionsspiel*, 7129. In the *Redentiner Osterspiel* there is a short dispute, and in the York play a long one, between Jesus and Satan at this point. It is not certain that the order of ll. 1407-8 is to be reversed: the MS. reading gives the strophic forms aab aab (1396-1401), aabb aabb (1402-10).—1418-9. The devil's retirement to Lombardy refers to the unsavory reputation of the Lombards in the Middle Ages as usurers, poisoners, etc. Cf. P. Champion, *François Villon*, I, 299 and Cotgrave's Dictionary s. v. *Lombard*.—1426-9. 1426-8 were probably spoken by David: *Tunc sanctus David fortiter clamavit dicens Cantate domino canticum novum (Gospel of Nicodemus, A VIII [XXIV])*. 1429, the beginning of the Palm Sunday hymn attributed to Theodulphus (for editions see Chevalier, *Repertorium Hymnologicum*), was probably sung by *Li saint*.—1439. This line should be bracketed as the scribe's erroneous repetition of l. 1437. (I read the last blurred word as *merraie*, not *mennie*). L. 1440 should follow 1438 without break and the MS. reading be preserved.—1452, 1457. In 1452 I read the MS. *ces*, not *oes*, which needs no emendation. 1457 should end with a comma, not exclamation point.—1495-7. For numerous examples of this proverb see Monmerqué et Michel, *Théâtre français*, p. 198-9. In 1496 read *tou[t]*, and on the use of *Car* in 1495 see Suchier, *Reimpredigt* (Bib. Norm. I, p. 66).

1519. Read *avés*.—1595. The insertion of [*de*] is unnecessary.—1599. The MS. reads: *Qi a estre ne nous croi mie*. The meaning seems to be: *Qu'i[l] a (i. e. esté amblé), estre ne nous croi[t] mie*.

1623. Insert [*et*] after *prophete*.—1665. This line should not be bracketed. The original probably read *chevalier* in 1664.—1667. Read *nus* for *nous* (=the subject of *veille* as well as of *vient*). Cf. l. 1683 where the MS.

reads *nus* (Ch. reads *uns*) and 4085, fol. 172 r: Et se nulz vient que tout soit tuer (*sic*). The plural *les* in 1669 and 1684-5 may be compared to the similar confusion in colloquial English expressions like "If anyone . . . they."—1677, 1681. In 1677 read *truans*. In 1681 read *n'avrions*.—1683-5. In 1683 I read the *ms. nus*. Keep *les* in 1684-5. Bracket (*vous*) in 1684. Cf. note to 1667 *supra*.—1690. The emendation is unnecessary and introduces an extra syllable. Read *gaaing[s]*.—1691. There are four knights in O. F. P. and in the Anglo-Norman Resurrection, but only three in 4085. In the latter the first knight threatens Paul and Peter, the second Philip, James, Symon, Thomas and John. There are reminiscent lines, but the development is not parallel in the two plays.

1716 ff. Christ suggests Psalm 56, 9 as the source. Cf. also Psalm 43, 23-6 which is adopted by the German plays at this point. (Wirth, *Oster- und Passionsspiele*, Halle, 1889, p. 91.)—1741-2. The transposition of the *ms.* readings in these lines effects no improvement.—1767-74. Read *veil* (*voil* does not occur in the text) for *voi*, 1767? Ll. 1769-74 probably belong to another knight, the capital letter of 1767 being intended for the second *Mais*.—1769. In 1769 the second word in the *ms.* may be *je* (instead of *le*); *leu* may be for *le* (a scribal slip, or a variant of *lou* which occurs in 891).—1797. Read *fais* for *faites* and *muër* for *muer*.

1805-8. These lines were intended as an octosyllabic *quatrain monorime*, corresponding to 1785-8. Cf. *P. M. L. A.* xxxv (1920), 478, note 24. Therefore in 1805 delete the inserted [*he*]; in 1806 read *com(ent)* and *tel(e)*.—1816. *Malaate* (for *maleoite?*) is insufficiently explained in the glossary.—1825-50. The complaints of the *Maries* were probably spoken (or sung) antiphonally. Cf. Lange, *Lat. Ost.* p. 161, the *Sainte-Geneviève Passion*, p. 298, Semur 8881 ff., etc.—1837, 1843. In 1837 the *ms.* reads: *preudons*. In 1843 bracket (*Des*).—1864. The *unguentarius* appears as early as the eleventh century in the liturgical drama (see K. Young, *P. M. L. A.* xxiv, 302).—1890-1. Among the properties ascribed to *Sanguisorba officinalis* (la pimprenelle), according to E. Rolland, *Flore populaire*, v, 270 is its ability to *rendre le teint frais aux femmes*.—1893. Read *Tel(e)* and conserve *a*.

1910. Read *ai(d)e*.—1913. There is probably a *lucuna* after 1912 due to turning the folio. Delete brackets.—1930 ff. Not spoken by Marie Magdelaine since she would be *la plus jeune* (1936) and therefore could not be *Vous qui parlez*, 1934.—1946-7. Between these two lines supply the rubric (*Mark* xvi, 4): Et respicientes viderunt revolutum lapidem, and in 1947 read: *Suer*, or *va bien [nostre] besogne*.—1949. I read the *ms.*: *entrer n'i puissions*. The insertion of [*ne*] is unnecessary.—1954. I read the *ms.*: *Nazarö*.—1981. The emendation is incorrect, or at best superfluous. If *nous*, as usually in this construction, is the indirect object of *enseigner*, the past participle would not agree with it; if *nous* be considered the direct object (a much rarer construction), the past participle need not agree with it (see Foulet, *Petite Syntaxe*, § 114). The line is of course too long in any case.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.



## THE POEMS IN CARLYLE'S TRANSLATION OF WILHELM MEISTER

In a recent review<sup>1</sup> of Miss Simmons' monograph on *Goethe's Lyric Poems in English Translation prior to 1860*, 202 pp., Madison, 1919 (*University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 6), Professor W. Kurrelmeyer has singled out for close scrutiny those pages of the book that deal with the poems in Carlyle's translation of *Wilhelm Meister*. His findings suggested a re-examination of what must be admitted to be a rather complicated question. The results of this gleaning were somewhat surprising and seemed sufficiently interesting to warrant the publication of the following notes.

*First.* On the basis of the editions accessible to her and of Carlyle's prefaces of 1824 and 1839 reprinted in them, Miss Simmons apparently considered herself justified in assuming that the 1824 text of the *Apprenticeship* followed closely the German original and that it remained substantially unchanged in the subsequent editions of 1839 and after. She therefore registered the poems found in the later editions, as for instance the Centenary Edition, under the year 1824 as the date of their first publication. Professor Kurrelmeyer, by comparison of the text of 1824 with that of 1839, shows that this assumption is not warranted. Carlyle allowed himself in 1824 at least one marked deviation from the German original, and in 1839 he made several not insignificant changes in the text of 1824, notwithstanding the fact that in the two prefaces he makes statements which seem to preclude such a procedure. The relation of the different editions of Carlyle's *Wilhelm Meister* has never been made the subject of specific inquiry, and considerable uncertainty on this point exists apparently to this day. Even Professor Kurrelmeyer's important corrections do not tell the whole story.

In his preface of 1824 Carlyle writes of the *Apprenticeship*: "Fidelity is all the merit I have aimed at . . . to alter anything was not in my commission. . . . Accordingly, except a few phrases

<sup>1</sup> *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxv (1920), 487-492.

and sentences, not in all amounting to a page, which I have dropped as evidently unfit for the English taste, I have studied to present the work exactly as it stands in German." But in spite of this, the entire thirty-two lines of Philine's song in Book v, Chap. 10, are omitted. In the preface of 1839, on the other hand, in speaking of the relation of the new text to the earlier one, he merely says that in the *Apprenticeship* he "made many little changes"; and yet, aside from whatever other divergences may or may not exist, this innocent reference to "little" changes is meant to cover the reinstatement of the omitted song of Philine and a complete rewriting of Mignon's song at the opening of Book III.<sup>2</sup>

A feeling of uncertainty is bound to result from the consideration of these facts. It will be even increased if one examines, for instance, the text of the *Collected Works* of 1858 (16 vols., London, Chapman and Hall). Volumes xv, and xvi, which contain *Wilhelm Meister*, furnish no statement whatever as to any further changes or revision. Nevertheless, in Mignon's song alone I notice as many as five not unimportant deviations from the version given by Miss Simmons (p. 19), which according to Professor Kurrelmeyer follows the text of 1839 (I myself have no access to this or any of the earlier editions). They are the following:

- I, 1. 1839: . . . where lemon-trees do bloom,  
1858: . . . where citron-apples bloom,
- I, 6. 1839: O my beloved one, I with thee would go!  
1858: O my true lov'd one, thou with me must go!
- II, 3. 1839: . . . and look me on:  
1858: . . . and look each one:
- II, 6. 1839: . . . I with thee would go!  
1858: . . . thou with me must go!
- III, 1. 1839: Know'st thou the mountain bridge that hangs on cloud?<sup>3</sup>  
1858: Know'st thou the hill, the bridge that hangs on cloud?

---

<sup>2</sup> In the light of such loose and misleading statements one becomes sceptical even in regard to the 1839 text of the *Travels*, of which Carlyle says that he "changed little or nothing" as compared with the original text in *German Romance* of 1827. The presence or absence of change in the lyrics is of course easily discovered, provided one has access to the respective editions; but other changes would reveal themselves only through a systematic comparison.

<sup>3</sup> Thus Miss Simmons; hardly correctly. The Centenary Edition, in the text, prints "mountain, bridge," as do the other editions available to me, while in his "Introduction" Mr. Traill, the editor, prints "mountain-bridge." Cf. below, foot-note 6.

Most of these changes are rather questionable. The second and fourth are hardly intelligible in view of the original German, "Möcht' ich mit dir . . . ziehn!", especially as they even necessitated a corresponding change in the text of the novel itself. In which edition these altered readings were first introduced and how long they maintained themselves I am unable to say. So much is certain, that the 1858 edition enjoyed for some time the reputation of the best standard edition of Carlyle's Works and that the changes cannot possibly be considered as unauthorized.<sup>4</sup> At any rate, there are then not only two, but three different versions of Carlyle's rendering of Mignon's famous song, of which, to be sure, the second and third are far more closely related than the first and second.

The first version, of 1824, which is not easily accessible and which Professor Kurrelmeyer prints in full on p. 491, has not, as it might seem, entirely escaped Miss Simmons. She has registered it on p. 129, as of the *Edinburgh Review* of 1825 (vol. XLII, 428), where it occurs in a long unsigned article (by Jeffrey, the editor) on the 1824 edition of the *Apprenticeship*. As the latter evidently had appeared without mention of Carlyle as the translator, Jeffrey treats it as published anonymously. Nevertheless it is perfectly clear that the reviewer is dealing with Carlyle's translation, and Miss Simmons would have done well to follow up this clue and not simply record the rendering of the poem as "anonymous," as she has done.

As regards the *Centenary Edition* (30 vols., London, Chapman and Hall, 1896 ff.; vols. 23-24, 1899), generally regarded as the completest and most trustworthy edition of Carlyle, it apparently prints both parts of the novel according to the edition of 1839. At least the text of Mignon's song is clearly that of 1839.<sup>5</sup> Never-

<sup>4</sup>It is interesting to note that of recent popular editions those in *Everyman's Library* and in *Warner's Library of the World's Best Literature*, perhaps in consequence of copyright arrangements with the London publishers, have continued to print this 1858 version, whereas later editions by Chapman and Hall seem to have given it up again and returned to the text of 1839. "A new edition, revised" by Houghton Mifflin & Co. (2 vols., Boston, n. d.) shows even the following contamination: the 1858 version in the first four instances, but the 1839 reading (mountain, bridge) in the fifth.

<sup>5</sup>In the rendering of the Minstrel's song, "Wer nie sein Brot mit Tränen ass," the first stanza in the *Centenary Edition* ends, "ye heavenly Powers." All other editions accessible to me read, "ye gloomy Powers," and in Carlyle's Goethe article in the *Foreign Review* of 1828 (II, 105) I find "ye

theless the editor, H. D. Traill, thruout his "Introduction" does not so much as mention the revision of that year. On the contrary, he connects Carlyle's work on the translation exclusively with the years 1823-4. He states at some length that "at that particular stage of his career," i. e., late in 1823, Carlyle was "inspired, perhaps for the first and last time, as a verse translator by Mignon's famous song," and thereupon, to prove his point, admiringly quotes the first two lines of the last stanza—in the completely altered version of 1839!

Know'st thou the mountain-bridge\* that hangs on cloud?  
The mules in mist grope o'er the torrent loud.

It is perfectly clear therefore that he is as little aware as is Miss Simmons of the existence of the earlier (1824) version of Mignon's song, and his further remarks about what he conceives to have been Philine's special attraction for Carlyle—no matter whether in itself the point is correctly taken or not—plainly show that he knows as little as she does of the original omission of the damsel's song.

Mr. Traill's introduction is moreover meant to apply not only to the *Apprenticeship*, but to the novel as a whole, and he indeed refers in it to the *Travels* as well. Nevertheless, the only period which he assigns to Carlyle's work on *Wilhelm Meister* is that from September, 1823, to early in 1824; nor is there any mention of the fact that the *Travels* originally formed part of the *Specimens of German Romance* (1827). The "Introduction" to the latter (vols. 21-22), from which the *Travels* are of course omitted, does not contain one word of explanation either. In fact, Mr. Traill's two introductions, taken together, would amply justify the confusion which prevails on this point in numerous works of reference<sup>7</sup>

unseen Powers." I am unable, at this writing, to account for this change in the Centenary Edition and wonder whether it is actually Carlyle's. Interesting, in this connection, is a statement by A. H. C[lough] in his review of the 1859 edition of Aytoun and Martin's *Poems and Ballads of Goethe* (*Fraser's Magazine*, vol. LIX, 713): "There is . . . an evident unwillingness to render *himmlischen* simply and without any addition by *heavenly*."

\* This is not even the reading of his own subsequent text (cf. above, footnote 3), and I am inclined to believe that there is no authority for it whatever.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. e. g. Wülcker's misleading statement in his *Geschichte der englischen Literatur* (1896, p. 559), where, after mentioning the work on the *Life of*

and which is even supported by some of the editions of as responsible and widely known publishers as the London house of Chapman and Hall. I refer, for instance, to their undated edition in three volumes of the *Apprenticeship and Travels* (evidently identical with vols. 33-35 of the *People's Edition*, 1871-74; published in this country with the imprint of Scribner, Welford and Co. of New York). The text printed is probably that of 1839, clearly not the earlier texts of 1824 and 1827, but none the less each one of the three volumes (even vol. 3, which contains nothing but the *Travels*!) bears on the title page the utterly misleading date, [1824].

In the light of so astonishing a situation as this, Professor Kurrelmeyer's censure of Miss Simmons for not having "the least knowledge, or concern, about earlier and later versions . . . of Carlyle" would seem to apply with even stronger force to the editor of the *Centenary Edition*, who, no doubt, enjoyed the advantage of access to all the earlier editions concerned.

*Second.* As regards the lyrics in Carlyle's translation of the *Travels*, Professor Kurrelmeyer shows that Miss Simmons has created considerable confusion in her Index E. Not only does she assign to the year 1824 the lyrics from the *Travels*, which were not published till 1827, but, despite Carlyle's definite statement in his Preface of 1839, she fails to recognize that he translated from the German edition of 1821 and adhered to this text even after Goethe in 1829 had published a second version of the *Wanderjahre*, which in many respects differs widely from that of 1821.

The error is a serious one. As a result, five poems which Carlyle never translated have been erroneously assigned to him, while six, which he did translate, have not been listed. Fortunately, practically all of these "poems" are single short stanzas, some of them merely "Sprüche" of two or four lines, so that the illegitimate gain amounts in all to 56 lines, the unjustified loss to only 22 lines, all of them very little known and rarely printed. This circumstance is not mentioned to excuse Miss Simmons, but merely to show the proportionate extent of the defect in an investigation which attempts to survey, for a first time and under exceedingly

*Schiller* in 1823-24, the author continues: "eine Übersetzung von Goethes 'Wilhelm Meister' schloss sich an, und 1827 folgte eine 'Sammlung von deutschen Erzählungen' (*Specimens of German Romance*)."



difficult conditions, a material consisting approximately of 500 single poems and "Sprüche" with a total of over 10,000 lines, in 1500 different versions or printings.

Goethe's edition of 1821 was prefaced by a group of short poems or 'Sprüche,' all of which were omitted in the later edition of 1829. In the Weimar edition, aside from being enumerated in front of the variants of the *Wanderjahre* in vol. 25, 2, they are confusingly scattered thru different volumes and groups of the *Gedichte*, inclusive of the *West-östlicher Divan*. Professor Kurrelmeyer, after pointing out Miss Simmons' error in overlooking these poems in Goethe and failing to recognize them in Carlyle, continues (p. 489 f.):

"Carlyle translated all but two of these poems, which first appeared in *German Romance* (IV, 33 ff.), and which could have been found in any subsequent edition of Carlyle's translation. The poems in question are: *Wandersegen*<sup>8</sup> (Weim. Ed. III, 160); *Prüft das Geschick dich* (VI, 119); *Was machst du an der Welt* (VI, 120); *Enweri sagt's* (VI, 121); *Mein Erbtheil wie herrlich* (VI, 121); *Noch ist es Tag* (VI, 119)."

Even this statement, however, does not correctly represent the actual situation. According to it, one would have to assume that Carlyle translated six poems out of a group of eight, whereas, as a matter of fact, the *Wanderjahre* of 1821 were prefaced by eleven such pieces, of which Carlyle translated eight. Professor Kurrelmeyer, to be sure, mentions the two remaining renderings of Carlyle in a preceding paragraph, in which he deals with the "group of nine poems printed in the Weimar Edition (v, 24-31)<sup>9</sup> under the heading 'Aus Wilhelm Meister,'" without however stating that these two from this heterogeneous group belong also to the prefatory group in question. But even if this allowance is made, the statement should not be that Carlyle translated "all but two," but all but three. The three which he left untranslated are: *Ehe wir nun weiter schreiten* (Weim. ed. IV, 19); *Was wird mir jede Stunde so bang?* (VI, 118); and *Wie man nur so leben mag?* (III, 162).

<sup>8</sup> I. e., "Die Wanderjahre sind nun angetreten" ("To travel now th' Apprentice does essay"). The title *Wandersegen*, was not given the poem till later.

<sup>9</sup> Should read v, 1, 24-31. The poems in question are, *Wusste kaum genau zu sagen* and *Und so heb' ich alte Schätze*.

A clear and easy survey of this question is further complicated by the fact that Carlyle changed the order of those poems which he retained. Numbering consecutively from 1 to 11 the poems as listed in the Weimar edition (25, 2, 1), Carlyle translated, in order, 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 2, and left out 4, 5, 11.

Professor Kurrelmeyer has clearly proved that in her discussion of the lyrics in Carlyle's *Wilhelm Meister* Miss Simmons has committed serious errors, and all interested in her study are under obligation to him for the thoroughness with which he has proceeded. At the same time, in justice to Miss Simmons and her labors, it should not be overlooked that, a tyro, she went astray in a field in which even veterans and specialists have stumbled.

There are no doubt other omissions and errors that will gradually show in some of Miss Simmons' bibliographical data, for a first survey of so extensive a field cannot possibly be expected to be perfect. But it is one of the services of her study, and not its least, that it has furnished the pegs on which to hang future observations and chance discoveries, which heretofore have too often been destined to remain scattered or entirely unregistered. From my own collections I could furnish already quite a few such items. So no doubt could many others. Translation literature is a subject of investigation of which both the importance and the difficulty have long been underestimated. It has generally received but niggardly treatment in the bibliographies of both of the national literatures concerned in each case. The ground is therefore but ill broken, and much pioneer work will still have to be done before such efforts as, for instance, have been devoted to the bibliography of German literature in English translations in the third edition of volume IV of Goedeke's *Grundriss* can lay claim to even approximate accuracy and completeness.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

University of Wisconsin.

## TWO NOTES ON *SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT*

Two passages in this splendid Middle English poem have caused difficulty and various comments. The first is line 160:

And scholes under schankes þere þe schalk rides.

Here the trouble centers about *scholes*, which Morris in his glossary explained as "hands down(?), or perhaps an error for shoes." Skeat (*Trans. of Phil. Soc.*, 1903-6, p. 366) regarded it as meaning 'thin plates,' comparing Swed. *skolla*. He thought *scholes* in this place "the side-flaps of a saddle (to prevent the leg-armor from galling the horse)." Cyril Brett (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, x, 189) rightly pointed out, as opposed to Skeat's note, that the word occurs in the description of the knight's dress, not the horse's accouterments. He suggested "leather or other protection under or inside the thighs," as in modern riding breeches. P. G. Thomas (*Eng. Stud.*, XLVII, 311) tried to connect the word with OF. *cholet*, explained by Godefroy as *soulet* 'little sole.' This would make the word equivalent to *choletz*,<sup>1</sup> with *ch* for *sch*. Such a *ch* for *sch* does occur rarely in the poem, as *cheldez* for *scheldez* 'shields' in line 1611, though not there alliterating, and in *worchip* 'worship' in 1976. Thomas's explanation of the phonology is not convincing, however, especially if some simpler interpretation is possible. The word is not in the *NED.*, so far as I have found.

In spite of its extreme simplicity I propose *scho-les* 'shoeless.' The Green Knight has come to King Arthur's court in the simplest array. He bears no armor of the ordinary sort, either defensive or offensive. His head is bare except for his flowing locks. He wears a *strayt cote*, a *mantile abof*, green *hose*, and the spurs needed in managing his horse. From head to foot the intruder on the Christmas festivities differs from the usual knightly visitor. Compare with this the elaborate arming of Sir Gawain before he sets out on his quest, lines 566 to 589, and the special mention of *þe sabatounz*, or steel shoes so important in the protective armor of the medieval knight. A quotation from *Piers Plowman* (B. XVIII,

<sup>1</sup> With *z* for *Me. ȝ* when equivalent to voiced *s*, as always in this article.



follows: "The hero by his visage verily seemed to well nigh every man in looks glowing and lovely in all his limbs." This entirely omits *alle on hwes*, of which *on* is the alliterative word, and connects 868 with the preceding rather than the following lines. Perhaps the punctuation above will be justified by my new rendering.

May I suggest an interpretation which again has the advantage of simplicity, preserves the alliteration, and follows more closely the poet's syntax. It should be remembered that Sir Gawain has been *dispoyled . . . of his bruny and of his bryzt wedez* by those who serve him in his chamber, and has been garbed anew from the *ryche robes* brought by retainers of the Green Knight, although of course Gawain does not know him as such. The literary convention of the disguise, as usual in early romances, is supported by the conventional obtuseness of the hero—none is so blind as he that will not see. Though that is not distinctly stated, the borrowed finery is probably of the host's favorite color. In any case, the poet says of the robing:

Soon as he took one and decked himself therein,  
One that sat on him seemly with its sailing skirts,  
The spring (ver), compared with his appearance (visage), verily seemed  
Well nigh to each hero all one in hue;  
Glowing (lowande) in looks and lovely in all his limbs,  
A comelier knight Christ never made,  
they thought;  
From whence in world he were,  
It seemed that he mought  
Be prince without a peer,  
In field where fierce men fought.

One or two notes of further explanation. *Ver* is OF. *ver* 'spring,' used once by Chaucer (*Troil.*, I, 157),

With newe grene, of lusty Ver the pryme;

and occasionally otherwise in Middle English, as by Gower (*Conf. Amant.*, vii, 1014),

Whan Ver his seson hath begonne.

*Visage* may be 'countenance' only, but seems rather to refer to 'appearance, look of the man (as a whole)'; see *NED.*, meanings 7, 8, and Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vii, 4046. *Hwes* may be construed as an adverbial genitive, or is perhaps an error for *hwe*



'hue,' s (z) having been carelessly added by the scribe as in several cases in the poems; for *Gawain* cf. *slēzez* (893), *wedez* (987), *crowez* (1412), *frekez* (1588), *hepez* (1590). Still a third possibility is that the plural is the poet's, a change from the singular resulting from the two-fold reference in the comparison. At least such a change from singular to plural, to give more general relation, is not uncommon in the poems, as in *Pl.* 450-51, 686-8; *Cl.* 49-50, 167-8, 303-5, 379; *Gaw.* 54. Whatever view of *hwes* is taken can hardly militate, it is believed, against the explanation of the passage here proposed.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

*Western Reserve University.*

---

#### FORERUNNERS OF GOLDSMITH'S *THE CITIZEN OF THE WORLD*

It is usually assumed that Horace Walpole's *Letter from Xo Ho, a Chinese Philosopher at London, To his Friend Lien Chi, at Peking* (1757)<sup>1</sup> furnished Goldsmith with the plan for his *Chinese Letters*, which appeared semi-weekly in Newberry's *Public Ledger*, during 1760-61. This work, however, is so brief, extending over only five folio pages, and so restricted in subject matter, treating only political affairs, that it could have suggested little to Goldsmith except a title for his essays and the use to which he might put a Chinese character. But the foreign observer type of letter had been used in France and in England before Walpole's political satire, and in extended works to which Goldsmith's essays bear closer resemblances. Although Goldsmith was the first to make a practice of casting the familiar essay in the form of a letter written by a stranger in a foreign country to his friends at home, he had a public interested in oriental tales and not wholly unfamiliar with the discussion of social as well as political subjects in letters purporting to have been written by foreign observers.

One of the earliest of these is an eight volume collection entitled *Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy who lived five and forty years, undiscovered at Paris: Giving an Impartial Account to the Divan at Constantinople, of the most Remarkable Transactions of Europe;*

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Horace Walpole*, 5 vols., London, 1798, I, 205.

and *Discovering several Intrigues and Secrets of the Christian Courts (especially of France) from the year 1637, to the year 1682*. It was first published in English in 1689, going through twenty-six editions by 1770. In his preface "To the Reader," the English editor claimed to be merely a translator of the Italian version of these letters, which had been, according to his account, written by a Turk, found in a lodging house in Paris, and translated from Arabic into Latin by their discoverer. The writer of at least the first volume of this collection, J. P. Marana, was a Genoese who died in Paris, in 1693. Under the mask of the foreigner Mahmut the Arabian, the author was able to write the history of the age in which he lived, in a secrecy and security like that which is claimed for the Turk in the following passage from the preface to the 1770 edition: "Have, moreover, some respect for the memory of this Mahometan; for, living unknown, he was safe from the insults of the great ones, so that he might write truth without danger, which is ordinarily disguised by fear or avarice, having still reported the transactions of Christians with no less truth than eloquence." The chief value of the work is its record of current history, for which the letter scheme serves as a sugar coat. A certain amount of oriental machinery used is similar to that in Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*; but many differences in the use made of the scheme immediately stand out. *The Turkish Letters* are often records of a confused mass of facts, while nearly every one of *The Chinese Letters* develops in essay style only one idea. The former set forth instructive, historical facts, while the latter treat some minor vice or foible with a gentle ridicule which is both pleasing and effective. In the first we learn of wars, political transactions, and the intrigues of the courts, by means of a representation involving actual personages and facts. In the second collection we are given a picture of private life—especially that of the middle and lower classes—in a representation, for the most part, of fictitious personages and happenings. Goldsmith may have taken hints in regard to a plan from *The Turkish Spy*, but he used the foreign-letter-disguise for such a totally different purpose that a further comparison would be fruitless.

In Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes*,<sup>2</sup> which appeared in 1721 and

<sup>2</sup> Montesquieu, *The Persian Letters; with an Introduction and Notes*: Trans. from the French. London, Athenaeum Pub. Co., 1901.

were soon very popular, we have a more striking resemblance to Goldsmith's *Chinese Letters* than that offered by *The Turkish Spy*. The author of *The Persian Letters* pretends to be the translator of genuine letters written or received by some Persians who had been his guests. In these letters we learn that Rica, Usbek, and Rhedi had set out from their homes in Persia in order to study the manners and the institutions of the Europeans. Rhedi stopped at Venice, while Rica and Usbek pushed on to Paris. Very soon after their departure from Persia, a brisk interchange of letters took place between Usbek and his wives Zachi, Zephis, Fatme, Roxana, and the eunuchs, as well as between the travellers and the friends they had left at Ispahan. Using this letter device as a mask, Montesquieu satirized unmercifully the social, political, ecclesiastical, and literary follies of France. It is probable that Montesquieu's work influenced Goldsmith in his treatment of similar topics, forty years later; but a comparison of the two letter collections shows that Goldsmith was no servile imitator. In the first place, fifty-six out of the one hundred and sixty-one Persian letters are devoted to the development of the scheme, which involves a romantic story written in a rather flowery style.<sup>3</sup> *The Citizen of the World* preserves its unity with much less effort, since it represents all letters as being sent or received by just one character, Lein Chi Altangi. Goldsmith is not bound down by his assumed character; neither does he use as much oriental clap-trap in his exposition of vices and foibles as does Montesquieu. Having no moral purpose in view, the latter makes great play with Persian customs and with the happenings in the seraglio, often attaining to a license in language which never sullied Goldsmith's writing. Desiring to make virtue pleasant and vice repulsive, Goldsmith succeeded in giving us a fairly complete picture of the life of the middle and lower classes of people in the England of his day, while Montesquieu furnishes us with purple patches of French satire mixed with Persian romance. The latter employs the mask of a foreigner for a protection in casting forth witty and bitter satire against the people,<sup>4</sup> the government,<sup>5</sup> and the Church<sup>6</sup>; the former

<sup>3</sup> Letters 1-23 and Nos. 25, 27, 39, 41, 42, 43, 47, 53, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 71, 77, 80, 97, 127, 147, 161.

<sup>4</sup> Letters 100, 56, 48, 111, 114, 123, 135.

<sup>5</sup> Letter 89 is an example.

<sup>6</sup> Letters 35, 29, 69, 75.

uses the device as an attractive vehicle for a sympathetic criticism of customs and manners.

Lord Lyttelton's *Letters from a Persian in England to his Friend at Ispahan*,<sup>7</sup> first published in 1735, seems to be modelled after Montesquieu's work; but it bears a closer resemblance to *The Citizen of the World* than does its predecessor, *The Persian Letters*. Twenty-five years later Goldsmith treated the same type of subjects as Lyttelton had discussed—and in much the same manner. In the first of these *Letters from a Persian*, Selim writes to Mirza from London: "Whatever in the Manners of this people appears to me to be singular and fantastical, I will also give thee some account of; and if I may judge by what I have seen already, this is a subject which will not easily be exhausted." In the next letter he describes his experiences at the opera. Following this, is a letter "On Bear and Bull fights and Fighting Men at the Circus," in which the author describes one of the spectators. In the next, which describes a debtor's prison and tells the story of some of the prisoners, Selim exclaims: "Good Heavens! can it be possible that, in a country governed by laws, the Innocent, who are cheated out of all, should be put in prison, and the villians who cheat them left at Liberty!" A fine satire, in letter five, on the prevalence of intoxication and on the fashionable custom of gambling reminds one of the later, periodical essayists. The next letter tells of "The Loves of Ludovico and Horraria," "in illustration of the nature of love," while letter eight discusses "Government, Poverty, and Commerce." The delightful essay on toleration, in letter thirty, is illustrated by practices in England and by certain adventures which Selim had passed through. In letters eleven to twenty-two Lyttelton gives the story of Troglodites, to show that "Mankind becomes wickeder and more miserable in a state of government, than they were when left in a State of Nature." Using the guise of Troglodites, he satirizes the growth of corruption in the English Church and government. Lyttelton is far less advanced in thought, however, than is Goldsmith, altho his ideas on education are quite modern.<sup>8</sup> He has a tendency, also, to draw out his discussions too

<sup>7</sup> Lyttelton, Lord—*Letters from a Persian in England to his Friend at Ispahan*, London, 1744 edition.

<sup>8</sup> Letters 46 and 47.

much<sup>o</sup>—a fault avoided by Goldsmith. Although nearly all of the eighty letters, as the above illustrations indicate, treat subjects similar to those later employed by *The Citizen of the World*, there are noteworthy differences between the two collections. Taken as a whole, these letters are not so applicable in teaching, so catholic in view, so unified in structure, so good in portraiture, or so sympathetic and realistic in treatment as are *The Chinese Letters*. A comparison of the two collections brings out, then, in addition to several likenesses, the fact that Goldsmith, with his superior literary ability, made a much better use of the foreign-observer-type of writing than did his predecessor.

Various works in addition to those already discussed appeared in the first half of the eighteenth century and represented themselves as translations of letters written by foreigners in strange countries. Even if they did not exert any influence upon Goldsmith's choice of a plan for his essays, they are worthy of note as indications of the public taste for accounts of English and French customs and institutions as viewed by foreigners. *The Spectator* for April 27, 1711, contained an account supposed to have been written by an Indian king who had visited London and left a package of papers upon his departure. None of the other papers were published, however. Thirteen years later, Defoe published his *Tour Through England* (written as if by a foreigner); and in 1726 William Lloyd's *Letters from a Moor at London to his Friend at Tunis* appeared. The latter is more like a text book than a collection of light essays in manners and customs. In the twenty-four letters in this volume, the city of London, the public buildings, and the government of England are described at great length with an utter absence of satire or humor. In fact, the Moor is a mere name used to attract attention to this guide-book. At about the same time as the appearance of Lloyd's book, Marquis D'Argens published *The Jewish Spy*—an imitation of *The Turkish Spy*, but devoted for the most part to satire directed against Catholics. Different orders of monks—especially the Jesuit brotherhood—are ruthlessly attacked. Before 1752, translations from French into English were made of Graffigny's *Letters Written by a Peruvian Princess*, *Sequel of the Letters Written by a Peruvian Princess*, and *Letters of Aza*

<sup>o</sup> e. g., History of England, letters 58-68, and "The Story of Acasto and Septimius," letter 31.



*a Peruvian*.<sup>10</sup> In these collections the elaborate story of the separation of Aza and Bilía is narrated, with scarcely any comment on the customs of France and of Spain, the countries in which the principal events occur.<sup>11</sup> Graffigny's language is that of highly eloquent and impassioned love and despair—quite different from Goldsmith's usual style. These translations indicate, however, the popularity of the foreign letter collections at the time when Goldsmith began his work.

Goldsmith, no doubt, gained some valuable suggestions from those who had brought out collections of letters supposed to have been written by foreign observers, but he contributed much to this type of literature. His predecessors had done very little in character delineation, while Goldsmith's pictures of Beau Tibbs and of the Man in Black are interesting and vivid. Unlike his predecessors he had the further desire to instruct and improve his readers. Sometimes this purpose led him to attach a strangely English moral to an oriental story, but it gives added value to his letters. At other times, also, he loses the Chinese attitude and style of writing, thus falling below the consistent tone of Montesquieu's work. Goldsmith's habit of making Lein Chi appear, in many essays, to all intent and purposes, an Englishman avoids the harmful effects which may result from using a disguise too faithfully. The machinery in *Lettres Persanes* appears at times to hamper the author; and when it is stressed too much, it tires the reader. Goldsmith's versatile Chinese philosopher, however, is enabled to give us variety as a result of his wide range of interests. Goldsmith endowed him with extensive travels, a philosophical turn of mind, and friends that would lead him into all fields of activity. Consequently, *The Citizen of the World* contains a greater variety of subject matter than do the other collections considered in this paper. Using his scheme with freedom, Goldsmith reveals his own personality through it. Under his skilful touch the foreign letter type of writing took on a new and enlarged life.

LEVETTE JAY DAVIDSON.

Michigan Agricultural College.

<sup>10</sup> Graffigny, Françoise d'Issenburg d'Happencourt—*Letters Written by a Peruvian Princess*. Trans. from the French, Dublin, 1748; *Sequel to Letters Written by a Peruvian Princess*, 1749; *Letters of Aza a Peruvian*, 1751.

<sup>11</sup> Some satire is included in letters 14, 16, and 18 of the third collection and in letters 16, 21, 22, 30, and 31 of the first.

## COLOR IN LAMARTINE'S *JOCELYN*

In speaking of Lamartine's descriptions of landscape in *Jocelyn*, M. Lanson says: "Ici Lamartine a voulu peindre: il a prodigué les couleurs et ses descriptions pourtant ne sortent pas. Elles ne s'organisent pas en tableaux. Je ne vois pas ces Alpes, neigeuses ou fleuries; dans l'ample écoulement de la poésie mon impression reste indécelable, et si j'essaie de fixer en visions ces formes, ces teints, cette lumière, ces mouvements, ces bruits, je ne sens qu'une confusion fatigante; les objets me fuient." (*Hist. de la litt. fr.*, p. 952, ed. 1912.)

In this passage the remark: "il a prodigué les couleurs" did not coincide with my casual impressions in reading *Jocelyn*, and a closer investigation of the subject seemed of interest. In making this study, all cases of the use of color have been noted for the sake of completeness, but they have been grouped with reference to their use in landscape description, when there were sufficient to warrant it.<sup>1</sup>

*Blanc* occurs 49 times, 27 of them in landscapes and 22 in describing persons, animals, objects: snow<sup>2</sup> (13 times) as *un blanc tapis de neige*, p. 328, sun or moon light<sup>3</sup> (7) as *un rayon de blanc soleil*, p. 276; various<sup>4</sup> (7) as *la barque à l'aile blanche*, p. 281, *les routes blanches*, p. 216; persons, animals, etc.<sup>5</sup> (22) as *son chien blanc*, p. 28; seven examples of this last class refer to *cheveux blancs* or *blanchis*.<sup>6</sup>

*Blanchâtre*: (1) *un sarrau blanchâtre*, p. 170.

*Argent*: (2) *le duvet d'argent (du cygne)*, p. 78; *les cimes d'argent du pâle peuplier*, p. 253.

*Albâtre*: (1) *deux mains d'albâtre*, p. 310.

*Ivoire*: (1) *ses doigts d'ivoire*, p. 89.

*Blond*: (12) *ses blonds cheveux*<sup>7</sup> (9); *les blonds chapeaux de*

<sup>1</sup> The references are to the Hachette edition of 1853.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 55, 78, 83, 93, 113, 114, 115, 126, 145, 148, 149, 216.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 43, 47, 140, 253, 332, 332.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 50, 83, 301, 306, 307.

<sup>5</sup> Pp. 25, 29, 50, 71, 88, 106, 117, 172, 175, 195, 263, 326, 327, 334.

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 32, 69, 94, 175, 182, 214, 343.

<sup>7</sup> Pp. 35, 71, 88, 94, 112, 138, 195, 267, 310.

*paille*, p. 32, *ma blonde génisse*, p. 227, *son blond duvet* (du *rosignol*), p. 131.

*Noir*: 26 times, 12 of them in landscapes and 14 in describing persons, animals, etc.: trees<sup>8</sup> (6) as *les troncs noirs des noyers*, p. 219; various<sup>9</sup> (6) as *les sommets noirs*, p. 147, *les noires vallées*, p. 70; persons, etc.<sup>10</sup> (14) as *cet œil noir*, p. 112, *une soutane noire*, p. 45, *la chèvre noire*, p. 104.

*Gris*: (6) *une roche grise*, p. 50, p. 219, *une pierre grise*, p. 26, *la bruyère grise*, p. 55, *le ciel était gris*, p. 46, *je vis noircir mes murs gris*, p. 270.

*Jaune*: (7) to describe foliage<sup>11</sup> as *le sol jauni*, p. 326, *de mes chênes penchés la tête qui jaunît*, p. 103.

*Jaunâtre*: (1) *une mousse jaunâtre*, p. 127.

*Doré*: (9), to describe light<sup>12</sup> (6) as *le rayon doré*, p. 77, various<sup>13</sup> (3) as *vols d'insectes dorés*, p. 78.

*Orange*: (1) *ses tronçons d'orange et de bleu* (de l'*arc-en-ciel*), p. 129.

*Bronze*: (1) *sa plume bronzée*, p. 83.

*Brun*: (3) *le flot, bruni par l'ombre haute et noire*, p. 127, *le reste de ses jours est bruni par une ombre*, p. 314; *ombres, qui brunissent leurs flancs*, p. 78.

*Vert*: (25) to describe foliage<sup>14</sup> (22) as *ce feston vert*, p. 103, *ces murs verdis de lierre*, p. 217; water<sup>15</sup> (3) as *un lac aux flots verts*, p. 124.

*Bleu or azur*: (26) to describe the sky<sup>16</sup> (12) as: *l'azur*, p. 112, *ce dôme bleu*, p. 85; water<sup>17</sup> (5) as *mon lac bleu*, p. 103; various<sup>18</sup> (6) as *ses pentes d'azur* (du *glacier*), p. 103, *la grande plaine bleue*, p. 216; persons<sup>18</sup> (3) as *son œil humide et bleu*, p. 88.

*Saphir*: (1) *des arches de saphir*, p. 115.

*Violet*: (1) *ses pieds nus tous violets de froid*, p. 175.

<sup>8</sup> Pp. 79, 90, 281, 323, 326.

<sup>9</sup> Pp. 30, 53, 218, 326.

<sup>10</sup> Pp. 26, 27, 45, 83, 89, 114, 139, 222, 231, 241, 334.

<sup>11</sup> Pp. 79, 216, 223, 227, 325.

<sup>12</sup> Pp. 28, 33, 83, 132, 293.

<sup>13</sup> Pp. 128, 267.

<sup>14</sup> Pp. 48, 50, 70, 77, 79, 82, 84, 98, 127, 135, 216, 217, 221, 223, 236, 275, 289, 301, 322, 344.

<sup>15</sup> Pp. 115, 306.

<sup>16</sup> Pp. 47, 75, 77, 78, 83, 85, 122, 198, 217, 281.

<sup>17</sup> Pp. 82, 127, 301, 306.

<sup>18</sup> Pp. 132, 138, 218, 286.

*Rouge*: (2) *un étroit corset rouge*, p. 88, *un oiseau rouge et bleu*, p. 138.

*Rougeâtre*: (1) *ma torche jetait son jour rougeâtre*, p. 95.

*Pourpre*: (1) *les corsets de pourpre*, p. 32.

*Vermeil*: (2) *ce sommet vermeil*, p. 308, *leur corset de feu, d'azur et de vermeil*, p. 123.

*Rose*: (2) *la neige qui fondait au tact du rayon rose*, p. 122, *sa joue en rose de candeur*, p. 111.

This is not an imposing list when one considers that *Jocelyn* is 8027 lines in length, of which at least two-thirds are devoted to description mingled with narration or description alone. Many of these colors are used as fixed epithets quite without pictorial value: *ses blonds cheveux*, *l'azur*, *le rayon doré*, *le lac bleu*. When one considers the various shades of rose, blue and violet of the snow-covered Alps, one is surprised at finding only once *la neige qui fondait au tact du rayon rose*. The colors of ice are referred to twice: *ces pentes d'azur* and *des arches de saphir*. The one case where violet is used refers to the effect of cold rather than to color. In a number of cases effect of color is secondary as *des os blanchis*; the priesthood is meant in *un habit noir*; the quality of the bread in *un pain noir*; the season in *le pampre encore vert*. M. Lanson speaks of *les Alpes fleuries*; Lamartine mentions once each *la giroflée*, *l'aubépine*, *la mauve*, *mes perce-neige*, *les bluets*, *les pavots*, *l'iris*, *le réséda*, but never their colors; *ce lis blanc* is used figuratively and refers to Jocelyn's love for Laurence. Of shades there are only three mentioned: *rougeâtre* (1), *jaunâtre* (1), *blanchâtre* (1). He rarely leaves the cardinal colors and these are used "pure": there are no shadings by a second color nor are there even qualifying adjectives of so simple a sort as dark, light, or pale. Once he says: *quel bleu tendre*. His color sense seems to run along stereotyped lines with few variations from the accepted white snow, blue sky, green grass. In fact the lack of originality and power of observation in regard to color is striking. *La bruyère grise* would seem a delicate observation of heather in certain lights did not one suspect that the rhyme were just as important as the pictorial effect:

Que j'écoutais siffler dans la bruyère grise  
Comme l'âme des morts, le souffle de la bise.

It must also be mentioned, as this does not appear in the cata-

log, that the colors occur for the most part singly and at long intervals; contrasts and combination of color are infrequent. The contrast of black and white occurs six times;

Un drap blanc recouvert de sa soutane noire, P. 28

Un lambeau de lin blanc, une croix de drap noir, P. 334.

*Un pain noir sous une nappe blanche*, p. 222. (The contrast here is evidently intentional, although *noir* really refers to the quality of the bread.)

Il veillait sur une page blanche  
Et quand elle était noire, P. 29.

Jouant dans ses cheveux avec ses doigts d'ivoire  
Roulait et déroulait leur boucle épaisse et noire. P. 89.

L'ombre des noirs sapins me voile le croissant.  
Sa mobile blancheur semble sous ce nuage  
Une neige qui tombe et fond sur le feuillage, P. 75.

There are four short descriptions which M. Lanson evidently had in mind when he said: "Ici Lamartine a voulu peindre." (All colors mentioned here are contained in the catalog.)

La grande plaine bleue avec ses routes blanches,  
Les moissons jaune d'or, les bois comme un point noir,  
Et les lacs renvoyant le ciel comme un miroir, P. 216

Et que, du haut d'un pic, de plus loin j'aperçois  
Mon lac bleu resserré comme un peu d'eau qui tremble  
Dans le creux de la main où l'enfant la rassemble  
Le feston vert bordant sa coupe de granit,  
De mes chênes penchés la tête qui jaunit. . . . P. 103.

Et qu'assis sur un roc vous avez sous vos pas  
Ce lac bleu, comme un ciel qui se déploie en bas,  
Vous voyez quelquefois l'essaim des blanches voiles. . . .  
Sortir des golfes verts ou rentrer dans les ports,  
Ou se groupant en cercle, avec la proue écrire  
Des évolutions que le regard admire; P. 306.

Je vis se dérouler sous moi le paysage,  
Le jardin verdoyer sous les murs du village,  
La colombe blanchir les toits, et la maison  
Retirer lentement son ombre du gazon.  
Je vis blanchir dans l'air sa première fumée, P. 50.

These are pictures which could be transferred to canvas or visualized as M. Lanson tried to do, but they are not numerous in



*Jocelyn* nor can color be said to have been used lavishly in them. In fact Lamartine may be said to have put into practice, whether consciously or not, Lessing's theory that in poetry pictures which could be painted were out of place and that description should never be attempted except in terms of movement. This latter Lamartine did to the fullest extent. I quote only one example:

Chaque goutte en pleuvant remontait en poussière  
 Sur l'herbe, et s'y roulait en globes de lumière.  
 Tous ces prismes, frappés du feu du firmament,  
 Remplissaient l'œil d'éclairs et d'éblouissement,  
 On eût dit mille essaims d'abeilles murmurantes  
 Disséminant le jour sur leurs ailes errantes,  
 Sur leur corset de feu, d'azur et de vermeil,  
 Et bourdonnant autour d'un rayon de soleil.

P. 123.

This is one of Lamartine's typical descriptions: filled with light, with movement, and with sound. It is one of the rare cases in which color is used in a way other than commonplace. There are many other long descriptions in *Jocelyn* in which color is lacking, as of sun shining on the water, p. 57; sounds heard during a storm, p. 113; a waterfall, p. 219; dust in the sunlight, p. 132; breezes and perfumes, p. 124; an avalanche, p. 147; rain in the mountains, p. 321. The detail and originality of these, which describe in terms of movement, is noticeable, especially when compared with the paucity and banality of the first group, which describe more largely in terms of form and color.

EUNICE R. GODDARD.

*Baltimore.*

#### THE SOURCES OF THÉODORE DE BANVILLE'S *GRINGOIRE*

A study of the masterpiece of Théodore de Banville's "théâtre," the one-act prose play, *Gringoire*, reveals the fact that the playwright drew directly from several sources, which may conveniently be classed in two groups: (1) those that concern the principal character of the play, Gringoire himself; and (2) those that shed light upon Banville's treatment of Louis XI and the other secondary personages. On the subject of the former, Banville is silent; but, as regards the latter, he tells us, in the preface to the printed

edition of the play, that he is indebted to Michelet's *Louis XI et Charles le Téméraire* (which, as is known, is made up of the chapters from his *Histoire de France* that deal with the struggle between those two princes) and to one of Balzac's *Contes drolatiques*, the "Ioyeulsetez du roy Loys le Unziesme." To what extent Banville made use of these sources will be ascertained later.

We need not enter upon a discussion here of the anachronism of which Banville consciously made himself guilty in his treatment of the historical Pierre Gringore.<sup>1</sup> Suffice it to say that this anachronism had been perpetrated earlier in the century, and by none other than Victor Hugo himself. To be sure, the Pierre Gringoire of *Notre-Dame de Paris* takes part in scenes totally different from those in which his namesake of Banville's play appears. Nevertheless, the resemblance between these two is evident enough to make it almost unnecessary to adduce the fact that Banville's comedy is dedicated to Victor Hugo as testimony that the playwright drew direct inspiration from the novelist. Of internal evidence there is at least this much: Victor Hugo's acceptance of the slightly distorted form of the name of Pierre Gringore<sup>2</sup> is ratified by Banville; and of the real Gringore, born between 1470 and 1480 (the exact date is even yet unknown), Hugo makes the author of a "moralité" presented on January 6, 1482, while Banville is still more unconcerned as to the handling of historical facts and gives us a Gringoire who is twenty years old in 1469. In both novel and play the appearance and character of Gringore are essentially the same: they are those of a poet who has had to forego even the necessities of life in order to pursue his calling, but is too devoted to this very calling to abandon it for one more lucrative. It is to this legendary Gringoire, shabby but proud, that Daudet addresses one of the most fascinating of the tales contained in his *Lettres de mon moulin*, the "Chèvre de M. Seguin," written, in all probability, very shortly before the presentation of Banville's play

<sup>1</sup> For a full treatment of the life of Pierre Gringore and a discussion of the anachronism, cf. Charles Oulmont: *Pierre Gringore*, Paris, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> Acrostics appended to almost all of his poems make it clear that the name of the poet was Gringore. However, it is not at all impossible that he may have been called Gringoire even in his own day; both names are mere nasalized forms of the Latin "Gregorius" (modern French "Grégoire").

in 1866.<sup>3</sup> It would seem that Banville has taken the Gringoire of Hugo, made him five or ten years younger, and shown him to us as he was before he went up to Paris; in *Notre-Dame de Paris*, he is already the celebrated author who was soon to become Mère Sotte of the "Confrérie des Sots."

Without entering upon a lengthy disquisition, we may take it for granted that the hero of Banville's comedy is a composite character, made up of touches from François Villon, Pierre Gringore, and Banville himself. The elements of Villon in *Gringoire* are so clear that "he who runs may read." Gringoire's fearlessness and independence, his utter contempt of death, these are traits borrowed directly from the character of the older poet. But, more than this, Banville's hero recites two ballads, ostensibly of his own composition, during the course of the play. Examination shows that these ballads are the work of Banville himself and that they are distinctly patterned after two of the Villon ballads. The first poem recited by Gringoire is the "Ballade des Pendus," which is undoubtedly modeled upon the celebrated "Építaphe en forme de ballade que fait Villon pour luy et ses compagnons, s'attendant estre pendu avec eux."<sup>4</sup> To bring out a few of the parallels between the two ballads, I shall quote several verses from that of Banville; the similarity to the second stanza of Villon's poem is at once apparent.

"Le soleil levant les dévore."

"Un essaim d'oiseaux réjouit  
Par-dessus leur tête picore."

"Tous ces pauvres gens morfondus. . .

Dans des tourbillons qu'on ignore

Voltigent, palpitants encore."

"Regardez-les, cieux éblouis,

Danser dans les feux de l'aurore."

In the case of the second of the two ballads declaimed by Gringore, the "Ballade des pauvres gens," the influence of Villon is general rather than specific; for similarity in tone and attitude, Villon's "Ballade des povres housseurs" may be cited. Finally it might be noted here, in connection with the ballad to which Banville makes Gringore refer, with the refrain: "Car Dieu bénit

<sup>3</sup> Daudet seems to be using the name of Pierre Gringore as a cloak for that of a minor poet of the first half-century, Pierre Cressot (1815-60).

<sup>4</sup> Villon: *Œuvres*, ed. Lacroix, Paris, pp. 128-29.

tous les miséricords," that no source in Villon suggests itself, and that, quite incidentally, number twenty of Banville's *Trente-six ballades joyeuses* (Paris, 1875), the "Double ballade pour les bonnes gens," written long after *Gringoire*, has the refrain: "Dieu fasse aux bons miséricorde."

That Banville employs *Gringoire*, at least in one instance, as the spokesman of his own ideas with regard to versification, is a natural inference from the following parallel. In scene 8 of the play, *Gringoire* describes verse-making as a "délassement d'oisif. Cela consiste à arranger entre eux des mots qui occupent les oreilles comme une musique obstinée ou, tant bien que mal, peignent au vif toutes choses, et parmi lesquels s'accouplent de temps en temps des sons jumeaux, dont l'accord semble tintinnabuler comme clochettes d'or." This would seem to be a highly colored version of what Banville was later to express in these words:<sup>5</sup> "Dans la Poésie Française, la Rime est le moyen suprême d'expression et l'imagination de la Rime est le maître outil. Souviens-toi que, quand ta rime devient moins parfaite, c'est que ta pensée est moins haute et moins juste. Ne te dis pas hypocritement: 'J'ai sacrifié la Rime à la Pensée.' Dis-toi: 'Mon génie est voilé, obscurci, puisque je vois s'obscurcir ce qui en est le signe visible.'"

As regards the secondary characters of the play, we have Banville's own testimony to the effect that he had made use of Michelet and of Balzac. There is no indication whatsoever that he was familiar with Sir Walter Scott's *Quentin Durward*. Casimir Delavigne's tragedy, *Louis XI*, deals with an entirely different phase of the king's career. To Michelet Banville is indebted for the historical background of his play, though he takes the slight liberty of making Louis XI feel perfectly secure in 1469, whereas it was not until the death of Charles the Bold in 1477 that he could begin to breathe easily. That Banville read his Michelet carefully is evidenced by the fact that, in one instance at least, he quotes almost verbatim from *Louis XI et Charles le Téméraire*. The passage in question occurs in scene 5 of the play, and reads: "Pour logis de plaisance, il avait une tourelle sombre où avait coulé le sang d'un roi de France, assassiné par un Vermandois." The reference is to Charles le Simple (or le Sot) of France, who ascended the throne in 898, reigned for thirty years, and was then taken prisoner

<sup>5</sup> *Petit traité de poésie française*, Paris, 1899, p. 326.

by Herbert (or Heribert) the First, Count of Vermandois, at whose castle at Péronne he met his death a year later, probably as the result of foul play. The parallel passage in Michelet<sup>6</sup> reads as follows: "Les portes du château se fermèrent sur le roi, et il eut dès lors tout le loisir de songer, se voyant enfermé *rasibus* d'une grosse tour, où jadis un comte de Vermandois avait fait mourir un roi de France."

From Balzac's "Ioyeulsetez" Banville drew the local touches of his play (the *rue de la Cygne* in the town of Tours—it is the *rue des Cygnes* in Balzac—and the Mail du Chardonneret in the forest of Plessis-les-Tours) and, in a revised and abridged form, the story which he makes Nicole Andry tell the king at the very outset of the play. In the Balzac version it is Louis XI who, at the instigation of his mistress, Nicole Beaupertuys, plays the trick of having a rogue, who had been sentenced to death, cut down from the gallows and placed, all but dead, in the bed of an old maid, who first resuscitates and then marries him. This anecdote is related at the conclusion of the description of a merry carouse at the home of Nicole Beaupertuys, at which, besides the king, there are to be numbered among the guests Olivier-le-Daim and Cardinal La Balue, both of whom figure more or less prominently in *Gringoire*. Finally, it was in Balzac too that Banville could find the name of Simon Fourniez; for, in the very first sentence of the story: "Comment fut basti le chasteau d'Azay,"<sup>7</sup> we read: "Iehan, fils de Simon Fourniez, dict Simonnin, bourgeois de Tours, etc., etc." Loyse is, thus, the only character for whom Banville apparently did not go elsewhere for some hint or other, and Loyse is only the Banvillesque version of the comparatively stereotyped heroine of the Romantic novel or drama.<sup>8</sup>

AARON SCHAFER.

*The University of Texas.*

<sup>6</sup> *Louis XI et Charles le Téméraire*, ed. E. Renault (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1907), p. 42.

<sup>7</sup> *Contes drolatiques* (Edition définitive, Paris, 1870), p. 205.

<sup>8</sup> The author desires to express his grateful appreciation of the help and suggestions which he received from Prof. D. S. Blondheim of The Johns Hopkins University, and from Prof. E. J. Villavaso of the University of Texas in the preparation of this paper.



## REVIEWS

*Saints' Legends.* By GORDON HALL GEROULD. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916. Pp. ix, 393. 12mo.

Professor Gerould and his readers are equally fortunate in the subject he has chosen for his book, *Saints' Legends*. He, because he is the first to devote a volume to a type of literature of a single country, to which literary historians and critics have given such little attention, that he does not need to approach it from a new angle to write something original: they, because the author shows himself the master of the wide body of texts of, and studies on, a subject in which he has shown his worth in monographs on various themes, which have a direct and indirect bearing on it.

The two first chapters, "Definition and Use" and "Origin and Propagation," are models of compression in composition in the presentation of the well considered results of the widely scattered readings of the author. On only two points can the critic take exception. In treating this genre, as a whole, Professor Gerould has not differentiated, nor laid enough stress upon its early developments and, by not doing so, his sympathy has led him to cover with too wide a mantle of charity the faults of the type as a whole, when he makes such statements as "They are, in the nature of the case, ecclesiastical, but not narrowly so; they are moral of tendency, but not didactic; they inculcate piety, but do not of necessity teach doctrine . . . the legends show a common aspiration towards an unworldly goal . . . the lives of the saints represent the search not only for goodness but for truth" (4-5). From a wide survey of the subject very different conclusions may be drawn than those stated, or implied, in these phrases. In the Orient and in the Occident, in Buddhism, Christianity<sup>1</sup> and Mohammedanism, saints' lives were written for purposes of propaganda; first to emphasize some doctrinal point, later for the glorification of some particular saint or shrine. They go on all fours with the belief in miracles, which is their principal stock in trade, and the part they

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius in his *Hist. eccl.*, v, Proem. ed. E. S. Schwartz, II (1903) 400, 9-12, stated that he had included all the *Acta martyrum* in his work, because οὐχ ἱστορικὴν αὐτὸ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διδασκαλικὴν περιέχον διήγησιν.

still play in the educational propaganda of the one branch of the Christian church, which holds fast by its belief in contemporary miracles, is due to no accidental combination. In the early Christian church the first *Acta*, like the apocryphal gospels considered a supplement to the apostolic writings, were written to show that the church of the day was still the primitive church, as was evidenced, through the use of what was regarded as authentic documents, by the sufferings and miraculous powers of those who died for the faith. Very few, and in the light of continued investigations, in an ever diminishing number, are those which do not show accretions of a later time, marvellous deeds, which were considered as nothing but what was due, in the eyes of the interpolaters, to those of an earlier and vanished heroic age. At an early date an interested motive brought out a further development, the emphasis given to the miracles of saints of, or at, certain shrines, an indication, itself, of the development of the most crass of superstitions—itsself a relic of paganism—the practice of pilgrimages. In the competition between rival ecclesiastical organizations this new motive fostered the perversely fraudulent spirit so evident in later saints' lives. To further the objects of their propaganda those interested did not satisfy themselves with the productions of the lives of their heroes in the universal language of the church, and with their translation into the vernacular. At an early date popular tales and traditions were drafted for service, on the principle, enunciated and practiced long before Whitefield, that the devil should not be allowed to keep all the good tunes. The next step for those interested was to manipulate for their own use popular forms of literature, which had been formerly damned without stint, an instance of which has been shown convincingly by Professor Bédier in his *Légendes épiques*, who brings out the use made of the Old-French epic to "boom" certain shrines. A similar, if not such a profitable study could be made of this form of propaganda, in other types of literature, and in other literatures.

With these reservations, it may be said that Professor Gerould's definition of the purpose and intent of the type is as admirable as it is liberal, as is his outline of the development of its use in church service,—and the question of the diptychs is an intricate and difficult one, on which the final word has not been written<sup>2</sup>—for secular

<sup>2</sup>E. Bishop, in *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, ed. R. H. Connolly,

entertainment, and even for political purposes, in which visions played a part, not without an element of fraud. It may be well to cite here passages from two writers of the eleventh century, which show the prominent position this type of literature held in the purely clerical educational system of that period. The first is to be found in the tractate of Petrus Damiani, *De ordine eremitarum, et facultatibus eremi Avellani*, written 1045-1050,<sup>3</sup> in which the austere and obscurantist reformer gives an exposition of the regime of the monastery of Fonte Avellana, of which he was abbot. In the restricted course of reading which he not only recommended, but doubtless enforced, saints' legends took a high place:

Librorum quoque numerum non minimum dereliquimus, ut fratribus nostris, qui pro nobis orare dignentur, meditandi copiam praeberemus. Bibliothecam namque omnium Veteris et Novi Testamenti voluminum, licet cursim, ac per hoc non exacte vobis emendare curavimus. Ex passionibus quoque beatorum martyrum; ex homiliis sanctorum patrum; ex commentariis, allegoricas sacrae Scripturae sententias exponentium Gregorii scilicet, Ambrosii, Augustini, Hieronymi, Prosperi, Bedae, Remigii, etiam et Amalarii, insuper et Haimonis atque Paschasii, divina gratia nostris allu-bescente laboribus, plures libros habetis, quibus vacare potestis; ut sanctae animae vestrae non solum oratione crescant sed et lectione pinguescant. Ex quibus nimirum codicibus nonnullos pro nostra possibilitate correximus, ut in sacrae disciplinae studiis intelligentiae vobis aditum panderemus.<sup>4</sup>

The second passage is found in a work written by a cleric with humanistic tendencies, who in a critical survey of both pagan and Christian literature, shows a sense of critical values in the positions he assigns to different types of hagiographical works. This work is the *De arte lectoria sive de quantitate syllabarum*, written in 1086, by a certain Aimeric, whose patron was Adhemar, bishop of Angoulême, 1076-1101.<sup>5</sup> He begins his general estimate<sup>6</sup> by stating the categories into which all literature must be distributed:

Cambridge Texts and Studies, VII, i (1908), 97-114; F. E. Brightman, *Journ. of Theol. St.*, XII (1911), 319-23; Connolly, *Id.*, XIII, 580-594; Bishop, *Id.*, XIV, 23-61.

<sup>3</sup>F. Neukirch, *Das Leben des Petrus Damiani, nebst einem Anhang: Damianis Schriften chronologisch geordnet*. Teil I, 1875, 94.

<sup>4</sup>Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, CXLV, 334.

<sup>5</sup>C. Thurot, "Documents relatifs à l'histoire de la grammaire au moyen-âge," *Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles Lettres*, Ser. 2, vol. VI (1870) 244-5. For other manuscripts cf. A. D'Ancona, "La Leggenda di Maometto in Occidente," *Giorn. stor. d. Lett. it.*, XIII (1889), 245-6; also in his *Studj di Critica e Storia letteraria*, 2d ed., 1912, II, 207-8, 277.

<sup>6</sup>Thurot, *op. cit.*, 249.

Et super omnia hoc notandum, quoniam, sicut genera metallorum quatuor illa, aurum, argentum, stagnum, plumbum, sic et genera scripturarum quatuor ista, autentica, agiographa, communia, apocrypha,

and, after assigning their due place to the books of the scripture, and to the patristic writings he continues:

Passiones martirum, sanctorum et vitae, quorum ignorantur scriptores et in quibus magis fabule quam veritas mera et magis adulatio quam vera rei expressio, et libri Origenis et caetera repudianda; in quarto genere plumbeo inter apocryfos numeramus. Passio Andreae, Laurentii, Sixti, Ipoliti, Mauricii, Agnetis, Agate, Lucie, Ceciliae, Vincentii, et vite sanctorum quas Jeronimus (et) Gregorius scripserunt, et regula Basilii et Benedicti, et libri Prosperi, viri sanctissimi, et exorcismus aquae et baptismi, omnia haec in secundo genere argenteo collocamus apostolica auctoritate.

In the second chapter of the book the difficult problems of the origins and propagation have been treated with great discrimination. Professor Gerould touches in turn upon the personnel of the legends, the interweaving of fabulous elements and popular fiction with historical data, where the psycho-pathological phenomena have been unduly exaggerated; the part played by Neo-Platonism in the development of romantic tendencies in the *rifacimenti* of the earlier, more sober accounts, and in the composition of new traditions; the multiplication of saints through paleographical and archeological misunderstandings; the repeated duplication of incidents and miracles, and, even of saints; the creative power of folk-etymology, and the absurd localization of saints, due partly to popular fantasy, but more to financial considerations. In his discussion of the question of Christian saints as successors of the gods he takes a middle ground between the views of radical critics like Usener, and those of more conservative tendencies, like Delehaye, tending, however, towards the former, as one is bound to do, who considers that in this, as in every phase of religious usage, the Christian church adopted and glossed over pagan practices. As temples became churches, the gods, who at first were treated in conformity with the much cited passage of Psalms, xcvi, 5: "Omnes dii gentium daemonia," were transformed into saints, pagan holidays appeared again as saints' days, and the preservation of a buried body, which in popular pagan tradition had been regarded

as the token of a vampire, became under the new dispensation an assured confirmation of the sanctity of the person concerned. Professor Gerould takes as a good illustration of this naïve fashion of adaptation, the creation of a St. Josaphat out of Buddha, and the legend of St. Veronica. He has noted how stories have passed from folklore into hagiography, and back again into popular tradition, if, as at times, the drift was not all one way, when a Greek romance was preserved with variations in the far-travelled life of St. Alexis, or when the epic hero Vivien became a local French martyr.

There are two or three slips which are worth noting. Professor Gerould has unhappily picked out the late historical romance, dealing with Julitta and Cyriacus as having "the sobriety and simplicity of manner that characterizes the most authentic passions" (31), but he depends upon a late Latin rationalized recension of the *Acta Cyriaci et Julittae*, of which the earlier form, found in a Syriac version, contains some of the wildest of fictions.<sup>7</sup> We did not need to wait for Kuhn to point out in 1893 that the *Apologia* of Aristides was embedded in the Greek text of Barlaam and Josaphat (47). That had already been done by J. Armitage Robinson in his supplement to J. Rendel Harris's first edition of the Syriac text of the *Apologia*, published in 1891. A liberal bibliography is offered (351-3) as a guide to the subjects of the first two chapters. It is curious that one does not find noted there, Alfred Maury's *Légendes pieuses du moyen âge*, published in 1843, the first modern treatment of the subject of this book. Of recent literature the author has failed to refer to such important articles as Harnack's "Das ursprüngliche Motiv d. Abfassung von Märtyrer- und Heilungsakten in der Kirche,"<sup>8</sup> and Geffcken's "Die christlichen Märtyrien,"<sup>9</sup> and Delehaye's *Les origines du culte des Martyrs* (1912). As a supplement to his own first-class study on the legend of St. Eustace, Professor Gerould should have mentioned the articles of A. Monteverdi,<sup>10</sup> and now one can add the

<sup>7</sup> Cf. H. Stocks, "Ein Alexanderbrief in den *Acta Cyriaci et Julittae*," *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengeschichte*, xxxi (1910), 1 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Acad.*, 1910, 106-25.

<sup>9</sup> *Hermes*, xlv (1910), 481-505.

<sup>10</sup> "La Leggenda di S. Eustachio," *Studi Medievali*, iii (1908-1911), 169-229, 392-498.



investigations of Meyer aus Speyer, Hilka, Bossuet and Lüdtke.<sup>11</sup> As the patron saint of England, should there not have been a reference to Matzke's and Krumbacher's enlightening work on the legend of St. George?

In the third chapter so well entitled "The Epic Legend in Old English," Professor Gerould has given us the very best treatment that has been written upon the subject, both on account of his knowledge of the background of the poems, and his keen perception of critical values, which allows him to do justice where it is needed, as in the case of *Juliana*. In discussing the sources, he has failed to note that for their themes it was not so much a question of choice of subject, as a transmission into vernacular of apocryphal traditions, for which the early Anglo-Irish Church showed such a fondness. One indication of this literary survival is Professor C. F. Brown's discovery of Cynewulf's use of an Irish redaction of the Latin text of *Elene* (71), and similar results will be reached by the investigation of other Old-English saints' legends. It is more than a coincidence that the subject of *Elene* and the *Dream of the Rood* were both written in Northumbria, where the cross was carried to victory in the seventh century by the reigning family, of which more than one member came into intimate touch with Irish culture. No such lists or lists of the apostles, which Professor Krapp postulated as the source of *The Fates of the Apostles* (78), could be, or were, used by Bede in his *Martyrologium*, as the work Professor Krapp cites as such was a German compilation, posterior by several centuries to Bede.<sup>12</sup>

The fourth chapter on "Prose Legends before the Conquest" deals with the legends of the saints common to the church universal, and of those of British and Irish birth, in Latin and Old English. In his account of St. Ealdhelm (97-8), Professor Gerould has missed the poem *De aris beatae Mariae et duodecim apostolis dedicatis*,<sup>13</sup> which deserves consideration for more than one reason. In it, use was made of the Abdias collection as it was in *Andreas* and *The Fates of the Apostles*, in the genuine *Martyrologium* of

<sup>11</sup> *Nachrichten von d. K. Ges. d. Wissenschaft zu Göttingen*, 1915, 269-287; 1916, 461-551; 743-800; 1917, 80-95; 703-745, 746-760.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Hamilton, "The Sources of the *Fates of the Apostles* and *Andreas*," *M. L. N.*, xxxv, 385-7.

<sup>13</sup> Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, lxxxix, 291-296.

Bede, and in the *Homilies* of Aelfric (121). Since the appearance of Professor Gerould's book, there has been published<sup>13</sup> an interesting early life of St. Ethelbert, as well as that of Giraldus Cambrensis, which was known to exist, but is not mentioned by Professor Gerould. The surviving fragment of a translation of the *Passion of St. Quentin* can not be cited as an indication of "the close relations that subsisted between the English and Gallican Churches during the second half of the tenth century" nor of the introduction of new cults (115), as St. Quentin finds his due place in Bede's *Martyrologium*,<sup>14</sup> and the Gallican influence was at an early period a distinctive element in the Anglo-Irish church,<sup>15</sup> a fact which explains the introduction of the leading Frankish saint, Martin, into the work of Ealdhelm (96), and of other English legends (113, 119-20). Is the English translation of the *Pseudo-Matthew* (123) the work mentioned in a twelfth-century catalogue of the library of Durham Cathedral, found in the same manuscript as an English life of Paulinus: "Liber Paulini Anglicus. Liber de Nativitate Sanctae Mariae Anglicus"?<sup>16</sup> If Paulinus represented the Romanizing tendencies, in his mission in Northumbria (57), Durham was the legitimate heir of the literary tendencies, as well as of the ecclesiastical usages of Lindisfarne, whence the monks brought the relics of St. Cuthbert amid the alarms of the Northman's invasion, to rest at Durham. If this invasion, beginning with the end of the eighth century, explains in part the decline of the English epic (92), the flight of the monks from their northern sea-girt monasteries, bringing their manuscripts with them, resulted in introducing an interest in a new field of literature among the clerical writers of the inland monasteries, where they sought refuge.<sup>17</sup>

In his fifth chapter, "New Influences: France and the Cult of the Virgin," Professor Gerould has had the advantage of having as his guide Paul Meyer's well-known article in the *Histoire litté-*

<sup>13</sup> M. R. James, *English Historical Rev.*, xxxii (1917), 214 ff.

<sup>14</sup> H. Quentin, *Les martyrologies historiques du Moyen-Age*, 1908, 89.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. H. Zimmer, "Galliens Anteil an Irlands Christianisierung im 4.-5. Jahrh. und altir. Bildung," *Sitzungsb. d. Berl. Ak.*, 1909, 582 ff.

<sup>16</sup> *Cat. vet. Libr. eccl. Cath. Dunelm.*, (Publ. of the Surtees Society, vii) 5.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. H. M. Banister, "Liturgical Fragments," *Journ. of Theological Studies*, ix (1908), 401.

*raire*, in the lives of saints in Old French, to which but little can be added in the way of information and critical estimates. The popularity of the life of St. Margaret (125) was, no doubt, due to the virtues claimed for it as a charm in child-birth;<sup>18</sup> and it should be noted, that the French life of Edward the Confessor was a translation of Ailred's work (141),<sup>19</sup> and the life of St. Thomas by Garnier de Pont Sainte-Maxence, one of the gems of Old French literature, deserves some other consideration than the fact, that it "has independent historical values" (135-6). In the account of the Latin lives, mention should have been made of Goscelin's lives of Ethelburga, and Wulfhilda only recently discovered,<sup>20</sup> although known to Bale,<sup>21</sup> the source of Capgrave's version. In connection with the French influences the subject of the evolution of mariolatry is properly discussed, because it was in France that this superstition began, and where were first written single works, and various collections devoted to enhancing Mary's worship. The phrase (146): "In England, as well as in Germany and France, we find during the tenth century an increased attention to the cult," does not specify the source of the cult, and dates it, perhaps, a century too early.

The sixth chapter on "The Conquest to the Reformation," Professor Gerould devotes to one part of that wide field, the legends, and saints' lives in works of history and edification, and he adds much to the elucidation of such composite collections, as the so-called *South-English Legendary*, the *North-English Homily Col-*

<sup>18</sup> P. Meyer, *Hist. litt.*, xxxii, 100-1; *Miracles de Nostre Dame*, ed. G. Paris et U. Robert, I, 13, II, 299; O. Davidson, "Isländische Zauberzeichen und Zauberbücher," *Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volkskunde*, xiii (1903), 163-4. On invoking her and the use of other relics; P. Saintyves, "Ceintures magiques et processions enveloppantes," *Rev. d. trad. pop.*, xxv (1910), 116; Duine, "Les Trad. pop. du pays de Dol," *Annales de Bretagne*, xv (1900), 491; Laisnel de la Salle, *Le Berry*, II, *Mœurs et coutumes* (1902), 19; *Mir. de Nostre Dame*, v, 260.

<sup>19</sup> E. Langlois, *Not. et Extr.*, xxxiii, ii, 10.

<sup>20</sup> M. Esposito, *Hermathena*, xvi (1910), 86-90; *Anal. Boll.*, xxxii (1913), 10-26.

<sup>21</sup> *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, ed. R. L. Poole, 1902, 498. The lives of Wulfhilda, and Ethelburga, as well as of Bertinus and Erkenwald are noted without the name of the author in the catalogue of the Library of Dover Priory, drawn up in 1389; M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries, etc.*, 458.

lection and the *Scottish Legend Collection*. His judgments on their manner of composition, their dates and authors are given with an authority which carries conviction, based as they are on a detailed and extended study of the texts, on which any future student will find an indispensable guide in the extensive bibliography of both editions and manuscripts. It is interesting to know that the *Festival of Mirk* was printed once at Paris, and twice at Rouen before 1500 (187-8), but it is more interesting to point out the cause in the fact that dozens of church service-books were printed at these two places in the same period, for the English market.<sup>22</sup> In discussing the sources of the *Cursor Mundi* (200-1), Professor Gerould has followed in the footsteps of his predecessors in attributing to its author the merit of collecting, as well as translating, his originals, a fault common to most students who have undertaken to investigate the sources of various extensive mediæval compilations. For instance, there can not be much doubt but that a single French manuscript<sup>23</sup> was the source of the Northern writer's account of the conception of the Virgin, and the stories of the childhood of Christ, and the harrowing of Hell, and furnished him the suggestion to make use of an earlier English rendering of the story of the assumption of the Virgin. To a Northern writer the poem of Wace *L'Etablissement de la fête de la conception Notre-Dame*, which formed a part of the original compilation, would have been of particular interest, as it was inspired by a miracle performed for the benefit of an abbot of Ramsey in the eleventh century.<sup>24</sup> The statement that the *Alphabetum narrationum* is "now supposed to be the work of Arnold of Liège" (201), is unnecessarily vague in the light of our present knowledge on both the compiler and the date of the completion of his work, 1308.<sup>25</sup>

The ninety pages (204-293) devoted to the "The Course of the Legend" are little enough to devote to the subject which includes the same wide field as the chapter just discussed, and in them the author shows himself once more a master of compression in com-

<sup>22</sup> E. G. Duff, *Westminster and London Printers, 1476-1535*, 1906, 204-6.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. e. g., P. Meyer, *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXXIII, 364-5.

<sup>24</sup> *Ib.*, 363.

<sup>25</sup> Compare now the best statement on the subject by E. Schroeder, "Legenda Aurea et Alphabetum Narrationum," *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. deutsch. Sprache und Lit.*, XLIII (1918), 545-8.

position. Much that is as new, as it is original is found in his criticism of the work of Chaucer and Lydgate, as writers of saints' lives, and his account of minor writers like Capgrave and Henry Bradshaw brings out their merit in a proper perspective. A few omissions may be worth noting. An occidental version of the life of St. Catherine (208) has been recently pointed out as being extant in the eighth or ninth century, two centuries before the date of any other evidence of her cult even in the Orient.<sup>26</sup> That the source of the *Childhood of Jesus*, found in the *South-English Legendary*, was the later French version, due to an Anglo-Norman author (215), has been noted by Holthausen,<sup>27</sup> and no reference is made to the possible relationship of the northern poem on the same subject (225-6) to Caxton's *Infantia salvatoris*, which Professor Gerould fails to mention. Analogues to the "chapel of Jerusalem" in the poem of *Celestin* (228) are found not only in Henry IV's Jerusalem, but in the stories of the deaths of Alexander the Great,<sup>28</sup> the emperor Frederick II,<sup>29</sup> and Cecco d'Ascoli,<sup>30</sup> to mention only great historical characters.<sup>31</sup> An edition of what it seems safe to regard as the poem on *The Holy Blood of Hales* (273), printed by Pynson, has been noted as still surviving in the seventeenth century.<sup>32</sup> The poem on St. Wulfhad and St. Ruffin, which contains some variants from the text published by Holthausen (273-5), was printed in S. Gunton's *History of the Church of Peterburgh*, published in 1686,<sup>33</sup> and such entries as "Versus pannorum penden-

<sup>26</sup> H. Delehaye, *Anal. Boll.*, xxxii (1913), 306-7.

<sup>27</sup> "Zum mittellengl. Gedicht, 'Kindheit Jesu,'" *Herrigs Archiv*, cxxvii (1911), 318.

<sup>28</sup> Th. Nöldecke, "Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Alexanderromans," *Denkschr. d. Wien. Akad. Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, xxxviii, v (1890), 47, n. 2; R. Meissner, "Mubassirs Aḥbar el-Iskender," *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, xlix (1895), 617.

<sup>29</sup> F. Guterbock, "Eine Biographie Friedrichs II.," *Neues Arch. d. Ges. f. älter. deutsch. Geschichtskunde*, xxx (1905), 46-7.

<sup>30</sup> G. Boffito, "Il 'De principiis Astrologiae' di Cecco d' Ascoli," *Giorn. st. d. Litt. it.*, Supplemento 6, p. 59, n. 2.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. e. g., J. A. Herbert, *Cat. of Romances*, iii (1919), 693-4, 720.

<sup>32</sup> E. G. Duff, "The Library of R. Smith" [1632], *Library*, 2d Ser. viii (1907), 127. For the fate of relic cf. St. John Hope, *Archaeol. Journ.*, lxviii (1910), 166 ff.

<sup>33</sup> Pp. 103-112, cf. 72. In the Christ Church catalogue, referred to below, one finds (M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, 1903, 110) the entry "Vita Sanctorum Alphardi et Ruffini fratrum."



cium in ecclesia Cantuariensi," and "Versus fenestrarum uitrearum ecclesie Cantuar.," found in a catalogue of the library of Christ Church, Canterbury, drawn up c. 1300,<sup>34</sup> and Dr. M. R. James's publication of, and comments on, the latter of these,<sup>35</sup> have escaped the author's notice. Much can still be done to localize and date both the larger collections and separate works, by investigations into the use of certain liturgical texts, connected with the history of various religious orders, and the libraries of different monastic settlements.

In the chapter on "Saints' Lives in Drama," Professor Gerould sets forth the fragmentary evidence on the subject that survives. He has failed, however, to bring out the fact (294-6) that the miracle plays, based on saints' lives, had a development, independent of the older mysteries, which were of liturgical origin, as the former had their origin in a wish to present dramatically the deeds of heroes, whose lives had been already sung in church by jongleurs, as is evidenced by the poems of *St. Leger*, *St. Alexis*, and others.<sup>36</sup> The introduction of bits of French into Latin mysteries and miracle plays has been, indeed, explained in an acceptable way,<sup>37</sup> as due to the use of "epitres farcies," which formed a part of the services, held in honor of the saints. The continued popularity of miracle plays in England is attested by a short but important passage in the *Manuel des Pechiez*, of William de Waddington,<sup>38</sup> written in the latter part of the thirteenth century, which has escaped Professor Gerould's attention. This rather rigid moralist inveighs against the fondness of the English clerics for such representations in church, where he considers only plays on the resurrection should be given. In the account of the *Croxton Play of the Sacrement* (304-5), there are several statements to which exception must be taken. It is not "unique in being the only drama known to us,

<sup>34</sup> James, *op. cit.*, cf. 122: "Versus fenestrarum uitrearum ecclesie Christi et rithmus, uersifice."

<sup>35</sup> *The Verses formerly inscribed on the Twelve Windows in the Choir of Canterbury Cathedral*, Cambridge Ant. Soc. Octav. Publ., xxxviii, 1901; cf. *On the Abbey Church of St. Edmund at Bury*, Cam. Ant. Publ., xxviii, 1895, 186 ff.

<sup>36</sup> G. Paris, *Journal des Savants*, 1901, 783.

<sup>37</sup> H. Suchier u. A. Birch-Hirschfeld, *Gesch. d. französ. Litt.*, 1900, 273-5; G. Paris, l. c.

<sup>38</sup> *Ed. F. J. Furnivall* (E. E. T. S.) vv. 4292 ff.

either by text or by contemporary notice, that was based on an *exemplum*," as we have more than one reference to more than one play, or at least, performance, of a play on King Robert of Sicily,<sup>39</sup> of which the source was certainly an *exemplum*. Further, the theory that the author of the Croxton play based it on a stock *exemplum* is not "confirmed by the Latin lines with which it is interlarded," as these lines have been shown<sup>40</sup> to be phrases chiefly Scriptural, such as one would expect to find in a play with liturgical antecedents. Again, the English drama is not "chiefly peculiar in its denouement: the Jew and his accomplices are converted by the miracle, absolved and baptized," as in one *exemplum*,<sup>41</sup> of which the scene is laid in Breslau, and in the French mystery,<sup>42</sup> where it is laid in Paris—where it is located by church tradition—those of the Jews who survive are converted and baptized. The reference in the "banns" of the English play to the performance of a play on the subject in Rome in 1461, leads one to connect it with the performance given in 1473 at the same place by a Florentine company in honor of a princess of the ruling Spanish house of Naples, Eleonora d'Aragona,<sup>43</sup> a factor which would account for the localizing of the play in Spain in the Italian drama. Whether the *Rappresentazione de uno Miracolo del Corpo di Christo*, of which there are several editions,<sup>44</sup> can be identified with the play of 1473, or as the source of the English play, must be left to future researches.

In the final chapter, "The Reformation and Since," is traced the fate of the type, after it had fallen into disfavor as an instrument for religious inspiration. It is interesting to follow its evolution from the time when it was fostered for sinister political purposes by a minority, in which the most important part was taken by the Jesuits, responsible as they have been in Papist countries,

<sup>39</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, II, 151, 205, 356, 378.

<sup>40</sup> F. Holthausen, *Anglia* XV (1893), 199-200.

<sup>41</sup> *Magnum speculum exemplorum*, Cologne, 1611, 380-1. In another version not found in the older editions, it is localized in Bruxelles, and the Jew's name is Jonathas as in the English dramas, (*Ib.*, 390-1). In another version located "in partibus Al[1] emannie" the one nameless Jew concerned is converted (*Speculum laicorum*, ed. Welter, 1914, 53).

<sup>42</sup> Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, II (1880), 575.

<sup>43</sup> A. D'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro italiano*, 2d ed., 1880, I, 287-8.

<sup>44</sup> Colomb de Batines, *Bibl. d. antiche Rappr. it.*, 1852, 34.

for the spread of the worship of saints, to the use made of it as a weapon of propaganda by the High Churchmen of the Oxford movement, and its availability as a source of information for the modern historical scholar. In the discussion of the earliest phase, attention could have been called to the influence exerted by an appeal to the reputation of various shrines, in the various armed revolts against the reformed religion and government.

One can only close this somewhat extended review by re-emphasizing the worth of Professor Gerould's book, from every point of view: completeness of plan, care in execution, sound critical judgments, presented in a style that commands attention; resulting in a monograph on a subject, the all-embracing completeness of which must strike the reader. The few hints, which have been added, are such as are welcome to any author who covers such a wide field, that he has to accept as authoritative the statements of others on certain details.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Cornell University.

---

*Theodor Fontane.* A critical Study by KENNETH HAYENS, M. A.,  
Lecturer in German Language and Literature, University  
College, Dundee. London: W. Collins Sons & Co. 1920.  
282 pp.

In der Mainummer von *The London Mercury* steht der folgende überraschende Satz der Schriftleitung: "In the last forty years Germany has produced precious little, beyond Nietzsche and a few poems of Liliencron and Dehmel, that foreigners could desire for its artistic merits or the depth of its insight or feeling." Hayens kann nun mit seinem Buch über Fontane seine selbstgefälligen Brüder vom *London Mercury* wenigstens über einen der grossen deutschen Realisten unterrichten, der die meisten seiner Bücher nach 1880 geschrieben hat, unter anderen *Effi Briest* (1895), worüber das Urteil von Hayens gefällt wird: "It is undoubtedly worthy of a place among the great novels of the nineteenth century!"

Hayens' Werk sollte eigentlich heissen: *Theodor Fontane as a Novelist*, denn es ist tatsächlich eine Art grossangelegte Disserta-

tion und keine Gesamtdarstellung des Fontaneschen Schaffens. Die frühere Fontane-Forschung ausser Richard M. Meyer kommt leider auffallend zu kurz dabei, aber das hätte durch andere Verdienste der neuen Arbeit aufgehoben werden können. Selbst wenn nur die paar Schriften benützt worden wären, die im Vorwort aufgezählt sind, hätte die Persönlichkeit Fontanes tiefer erfasst und besser dargestellt werden können. Der Verfasser bekennt zwar freimütig: "I have made no attempt to cover the ground of a possible source-book," aber seine ganze Arbeit beweist, dass man den Romanschreiber nicht richtig, besonders nicht "kritisch" beurteilen kann, ohne die wichtigen Quellen seines Lebens und Schaffens zu kennen. Dazu gehören hier u. a. die vielen aufschlussreichen Briefäusserungen des Schriftstellers und besonders bei seinen geschichtlichen Erzählungen, z. B. *Vor dem Sturm* und *Grete Minde*, die tatsächlichen Unterlagen.

Zu diesen Einwänden, die sich auf die Gesamtanlage und Auffassung des Buches beziehen, kommen noch verschiedene gegen einzelne schiefe Urteile, z. B., "Fontane understands nothing of stagecraft" (p. 122). Hier hätte eine vorzügliche amerikanische und leicht zugängliche Dissertation von Bertha E. Trebein: *Theodor Fontane as a Critic of the Drama* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1916) unsern Verfasser gründlich anders belehren können. Was dann über Fontanes Verhältnis zur "Berliner Schule" von Mauthner, Smidt und Zolling gesagt wird oder über Parisius (pp. 121; 64), klingt wenig neu. Dagegen hätte der etwas besser behandelte Hesekei (pp. 35; 63) mehr ernste Beachtung verdient. Wahrscheinlich leiden die geschichtlichen Einordnungen an einer nicht richtigen Perspektive. Etwas merkwürdig klingt ein Satz auf Seite 7; danach wären Fontane und Alexis "generally supposed (!) to be of French extraction." Ein Steckenpferd des Verfassers sei noch erwähnt, nämlich die genaue Untersuchung Fontanescher Titel (pp. 49; 175; 227). Anstatt *Graf Petöfy* wird z. B. vorgeschlagen: *Graf Petöfy und seine Frau*.

Am besten fährt Fontane unter Hayens' Betrachtung als Romanschreiber im engeren Sinn, und zwar in 9 Kapiteln: The Historical Novelist (*Vor dem Sturm*; *Schach*); The Story Teller (*Grete Minde*, etc.); The New World (*Quitt*); Berlin Plutocracy (*L'Adultera*; *Frau Jenny Treibel*); Unequal Marriages (I. *Graf*

*Petőfy; Cécile; II. Unwiederbringlich; Effi Briest*); Sentiment and Society (*Irrungen; Stine*); Poor Nobility (*Poggenpuhls*); A Liberal Conservative (*Der Stechlin*). Das klingt verlockender als es gemeint ist, denn es werden die einzelnen Romane nach einem gewissen trockenen Muster behandelt, etwa: *the actual story, the plot, the characters, the scenes, proportion, etc.* Aber alles ist verständnisvoll gelesen worden und wird ganz warm und verständig verarbeitet. Nur an wenigen Charakteren, z. B. von *L'Adultera* oder *Grete Minde* sieht der Verfasser vorbei. Besonders zutreffende Worte werden über des Romanschreibers Stellungnahme zum Leben gefunden (pp. 99; 211), wobei freilich wieder zu sagen ist, dass zahlreiche Briefstellen usw. schön zur Vertiefung beigetragen hätten. Der Dichter Fontane hat nicht "nur Bal-laden," sondern auch Gedichte geschrieben, wie sie Austin Dobson nicht besser geben konnte. Viel weniger gerecht wird der Verfasser dem Künstler Fontane. Es geht nicht an, "avoidance of the directly emotional" (p. 59) auf Fontanes Alter allein zu schieben. In diesem Zusammenhang wäre von dem Märkertum in der Literatur zu reden gewesen; damit hätte auch die Behandlung von Fontanes Verhältnis zu W. Alexis sehr gewonnen. Hayens zeigt übrigens gute Auffassung für das Verhältnis der Stilarten beider, freilich lässt er sich hier wieder ein schönes Selbstzeugnis Fontanes entgehen, nämlich den bemerkenswerten Aufsatz über Willibald Alexis.

Am Ende von Hayens' Schrift erlebt man eine Ueberraschung, das ist eine scharfe Abkanzelung Fontanes (pp. 249; 251; 269) wegen verschiedener Aeusserungen über England, die allerdings nicht schmeichelhaft sind, trotzdem am Anfang der Schrift gesagt war, "how well qualified he (Fontane) was to record impressions of travel." Schweigen bei diesem Punkte wäre m.E. klüger gewesen. Alles in allem bleibt Hayens' Buch ein bemerkenswerter Beitrag der englischen Literaturforschung zum 100. Geburtstag des freien deutschen Dichters und Künstlers Theodor Fontane.

F. SCHOENEMANN.

Kiel.



*L'Etat de Guerre and Projet de Paix Perpétuelle*, two essays by  
JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU; with introduction and notes by  
SHIRLEY G. PATTERSON. Foreword by GEORGE HAVEN  
PUTNAM. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1920. liv + 90 pp.

The reprint in a separate little volume of these two essays is due chiefly to their "modernity," to the "suggestiveness to students of present day problems," as the editors say.

In the first, "*L'Etat de Guerre*" (pp. 3-20), one certainly finds the stamp of Rousseau's thought and style. That man makes you think, even when you are not willing, for a thousand considerations, to agree with him. His arguments *are* arguments, and this is after all the best a philosopher can offer. Between truth and the search for truth, many already have preferred the second. At the same time, one may be allowed to say here that R. knew what he was doing when he did not consider this essay as one of his really finished products. By this the writer does not mean to say that the essay ought not to be printed; by all means students of R. must know it; but whether young students will profit much by it is another question; it is so abstract that it may well give them a distaste for R. One may say that one line by a "poilu" who has seen the great war and tells of his *actual* experiences will do more to convey to us the horrors of war than the pages of R. drawn from pure imagination, eloquent though those pages may be.

Towards the second essay (pp. 23-76) the writer feels very differently. Indeed it is a remarkably clear and concise statement of the very problems the world has a chance to solve today. The forceful dialect of R. is bound to persuade sceptics that the "*Société des peuples de l'Europe*"—today more simply "*Société des peuples*"—is certainly conceivable and feasible, if only men wanted it. Everything is there: Normal Angell's "Great Illusion," the problem of disarmament, and the ideas of the Hague Tribunal, of the League for Enforcement of Peace, of Wilson's League of Nations. Moreover, the discussion and demonstration is based entirely on the political situation of the eighteenth century. This is itself an advantage, for, in the first place, national prejudices are not quite the same today as they were in the eighteenth century; at any rate, the rivalries among nations rest on different problems. Thus we can consider them and their solution by an international league without our present day passions getting aroused and con-

fusing our judgment. In the second place, the political conditions today are infinitely more favorable to peace conditions; the people have more to say than they had in the age of R. The democratic spirit of our day has done away with the idea that the monarch has a right to run the state for other purposes than the general welfare. We no longer consider war as a conflict between "Princes," as R. would say, but between "Peuples souverains." And there are other things that seemed quite hard obstacles when R. wrote and which appear today much easier to overcome. Mr. Patterson would have presented these ideas to a larger public by publishing a translation of the essays, but this had been only recently done by Mr. C. E. Vaughan (London, Constable, 1917).

The Foreword of Mr. Putnam (pp. iii-xiv) is a masterly and concise presentation of the history of the idea of everlasting peace from Emeric Crucé's *Le Nouveau Cynée* (1623) to President Wilson's League of Nations. This history is preceded by a no less interesting account of the attempts made by the Roman Empire and then by the Church and then by the German Empire to assure peace to the world—attempts which were all futile. Mr. Putnam recalls with some details the earnest efforts to prompt the feeling for universal peace made by Prince Albert in 1861, at the time of the first World's Fair in London, and which many of us had indeed quite forgotten. On the other hand, Mr. Putnam does not mention here the contribution made to the cause of Peace by the Hague Tribunal, the idea of which was launched by the Russian court. Is it because everyone knows about it?

Professor Patterson in his "Introduction" (pp. xvii-liii) has another object in view. He wishes to offer to his readers a background to R.'s two essays. He gives some information on eighteenth century literature (the *Age des Philosophes*) in general, in which he makes no claim to originality, then on R. himself. We may be permitted to say that for an already quite confirmed Rousseauist as Mr. Patterson has been for some time, he has allowed some rather curious misstatements to creep in.<sup>1</sup> This must be ascribed, however,

<sup>1</sup>E. g. R.'s first readings were not "Romances of Chivalry," but rather pastoral or précieux romances; there is quite a nuance (p. xxv).—One would hardly call the house which Mme de Warens rented near Chambéry a "villa"; it is because it was not a villa that R. liked it so well (p. xxv).—The French Academy did not "reject" R.'s "System of Notation of Music."—R. lived at Montmorency for six years, but less than two

we are sure, to his desire to bring his little book before the public at an early date: it is needed *right now!* The ten pages or so devoted to the influence of R., in which Mr P. produces interesting appreciations by very great men of R.'s powerful mind make a good counterblast to the now fashionable sport of abusing R.'s so-called shallow democraticism or romanticism. The "Notes" are generally useful. The writer is inclined to think, however, that if Mr. P. presupposed, perhaps, too little general information on the part of his readers in the "Introduction," he presupposed too much at times in the "Notes." But this may be a purely personal opinion. The text adopted by Mr. Patterson is that of Professor Vaughan in the latter's admirable *Political Writings of Rousseau*.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Smith College.

## CORRESPONDENCE

## AARON HILL'S POEM ON BLANK VERSE

In his *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*,<sup>1</sup> Joseph Warton speaks of Aaron Hill's "Poem in Praise of Blank Verse, which begins thus; and which," he says, "one would think was burlesque:

Up, from Rhyme's poppi'd vale! and ride the storm  
That thunders in blank verse!"

I have been unable to find the piece in Hill's collected works,<sup>2</sup> and, although Warton's note regarding it is referred to by Mr. Beers,<sup>3</sup> and Mr. J. W. Good,<sup>4</sup> neither scholar seems to have seen the poem. Mr. Good says that it was "dated about 1726," but does not give the source of his information. Miss Dorothy

of them in the "house built for him by an admirer" (p. xxviii).—R. did not flee to Geneva in 1762 (p. xxxi);—then he was three *continuous* years at Motiers before he went to England, and again eight continuous years in Paris, 1770-1778.—As for the statement that according to Rousseau the state rests on "arbitrary convention," there is a probability that the author of the Social Contract would not very much like it (p. xxx).

<sup>1</sup> 1782, II, 251 n., or 5th ed., 1806, II, 186 n.

<sup>2</sup> Second ed., 4 vols., 1754.

<sup>3</sup> *English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century*, 271.

<sup>4</sup> *Studies in the Milton Tradition* (University of Illinois Studies in Language, etc., 1915), 166.

Brewster does not mention the work in her detailed life of Hill,<sup>5</sup> though she does say that *The Prompter* (which Hill published between 1734 and 1736) contains some discussions of "the relative merits of rhyme and blank verse," that were "illustrated by Hill's own efforts."

Miss Addie F. Rowe, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, has, however, found the very lines that Warton quotes. They occur in the middle of Hill's long unrimed *Cleon to Lycidas* at the beginning as a sort of digression on the subject of blank verse.<sup>6</sup> Undoubtedly this is the "Poem" Warton had in mind; he may have found it printed separately somewhere, perhaps in *The Prompter*. According to Cibber,<sup>7</sup> *Cleon to Lycidas* was published about 1738.

In the first edition of his *Essay* Warton did not print the words "poem in praise of Blank Verse" as a title, and seems, therefore, to have intended merely to describe the piece, not to name it. Any one who reads the lines carefully will see that their author would never have given them such a title, for instead of being, as they seemed to Warton, a serious attempt in the Miltonic style so unsuccessful as to appear almost burlesque, they *are* burlesque. Far from praising blank verse, they attempt to show that it is suitable to describe nothing but the brawls of "faction."

Oh what, ye gothic renders of the ear!  
Ye blank-verse bursters of Pierian bars!  
Strong beyond chaining comet; *swerves* of thought!  
Giant surmounters of wit's loftiest *Alps*!  
Ye hurlers of prose rocks at musick's heaven!  
What shall deserve the dread, your thunder bears?

FACTION deserves, and *claims* it: cries a howl,  
That paints th' attentive soul—Come, learn *her* laws.  
Give, to the deity, that shakes down thrones,  
Th' allegiance of thy Muse. Blank verse be *mine*.  
Guideless and boundless in aspiring grasp,  
And frownful in majestic *sullenness*,  
*Her* musick dwells in murmur. Let her growl  
For *faction*: taste *her* lust of loud complaint,  
And hang on empire's wheels the drag of hate.  
Range safe beneath *her* standard: mark its sweep!  
Unfurling into length, the dreadful *wave*  
Sees earth's chill'd kingdoms shake, beneath its shade!  
Kneel, and be *HERS*: enroll thy name—and *rail*.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

University of Rochester.

<sup>5</sup> Columbia University Studies in English, etc., 1913.

<sup>6</sup> *Works*, iv, 285.

<sup>7</sup> *Lives*, 1753, v, 275, 271.

GEORGE HERBERT'S *Church Porch*

In 1862, when George Herbert received his first appointment in the church, he became lay prebendary in the parish of Leighton-Bromswold, a little village in Hants, about nine miles west of the city of Huntingdon. The church there he found in a state verging on complete ruin. In the rehabilitation of it, he became deeply interested, and solicited funds for its repair, as well as contributing to it himself. The work on it continued until after his death, seven years later. That he was deeply interested in it may be seen from the fact that he refused to comply with his mother's urgent request that he give up the work, which she thought too strenuous for him, and that in his will, he left ten pounds to the Leighton-Bromswold church, no mean sum in those days.

About a hundred years before he became prebend at Leighton, there was born on the little low range of hills, or wold, on which that village lies, a boy who, too, became distinguished as a poet, and with whose work, Herbert certainly must have been familiar. This was none other than the poet Nicholas Grimald, who was born at Brownshold, as he says in his poem, *A funeral song, upon the deceas of Annes his mother*, a place that can with reasonable certainty be identified with Bromswold.

At the University of Cambridge, the University which Herbert attended, Grimald distinguished himself by his scholarship. He was graduated in 1539/40, then he went to Oxford, where he further distinguished himself as a lecturer in rhetoric, as the author of several Latin plays, and as a translator. Later, he became known as a contributor to that anthology then known as "*Songes and Sonnettes*," known now as "*Tottell's Miscellany*." This book is that mentioned by Shakespeare in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Act I, Scene 1, in which Master Slender says, "I had rather then forty shillings I had my booke of Songes and Sonnettes here"; from it, the grave-diggers in *Hamlet*, Act V, Scene 1, sing several verses of the song entitled *The Aged Lover Renounceth Love*. Before *The Church Porch* could have been written, the *Songes and Sonnettes* had already run through eight editions, which shows the astonishing popularity that it enjoyed.

A lyric poet, such as Herbert was, could not have been but thoroughly acquainted with the contents of this book, and it is not unlikely that from a poem in this volume by Grimald entitled *Musonius, the Philosopher's saying* that he got the following sentiment with which he closes the *Church Porch*:

In brief, acquit thee bravely; play the man  
Look not on pleasures as they come, but go.  
Deferre not the least vertue. Life's poor span  
Makes not an ell by trifling in thy wo.  
If thou do ill, the joy fades, not the pains,  
If well, the pain doth fade, the joy remains.



Herbert may have been acquainted with Musonius' saying in the original Greek, or with Cato's version of it, which appears in the oration delivered at Numantiae: "Cogitate cum animis vestris: si quid vos per laborem recte feceritis, labor ille a vobis cito recedet, bene factum a vobis, dum vitiis, abscedet; sed si qua per voluptatem nequiter feceritis, voluptatis cito abibit, nequiter factum illud apud vos semper manebit," but since the few fragments of Musonius' works, that were extant, and Cato's oration at Numantia were not in wide circulation, it is probable that he was more familiar with Grimald's lines:

In working well, if travell you sustaine:  
 Into the winde shall lightly pass the payne:  
 But of the deed the glory shall remaine,  
 And cause your name with worthy wightes to raigne.  
 In workyng wrong, if pleasure you attaine:  
 The pleasure soon shall fade, and voide, as vaine:  
 But of the deed, throughout the life, the shame  
 Endures, defacyng you with fowl defame:  
 And still torments the minde, both night and daye:  
 Scant length of time the spot can wash awaye,  
 Flee then ylfwading pleasures baits untrew:  
 And noble vertues fayr renown pursew.

Yale University.

L. R. MERRILL.

#### THE TEXTS OF LYDGATE'S *Danse Macabre*

To the notes on fifteenth-century manuscript-relations and on identity of scribes, printed from time to time in *Anglia*, I may add mention of an agreement between certain Lydgate-texts as copied in Brit. Mus. Lansd. 699 and in the codex Lincoln Cathedral C 5/4. These two volumes include among their contents Lydgate's *Churl and Bird*, *St. Austin at Compton*, and *Danse Macabre*, in the same order, and with the closest possible relation in the texts of the last-named poem. The Lincoln Cathedral MS. is too much mutilated to give conclusive evidence as to the other poems, but the presumption is strong that the source of the two groups of texts is identical. It was not possible to put the two codices side by side; but the hand and the mode of treating the page were so similar that the volumes may have been the work of one and the same scribe. As the full sisterhood of the Lansdowne MS. and the volume Vossius 9 at Leyden has been proved by the published lists of their contents—see my *Chaucer Manual*, p. 331, and reference to Robinson's paper, *ibid.*—the *Danse Macabre* texts of these three codices may be regarded as of identical type.

The *Danse Macabre* MSS. which I have seen fall into two main classes. One version, the Lydgatian, has an introduction in which the poet tells us his source, and an epilogue in which he gives his name; it closely follows the French, adding a few characters, notably the "tregetour" of Henry V. The other recension has

neither introduction nor envoy, omits nine characters of Lydgate's version, adds seven, and rewrites a number of stanzas; it was evidently based not on the French but on Lydgate's poem. To this latter group belong the Lansdowne and Lincoln Cathedral texts, which introduce freedoms of their own, as does probably Lansdowne's sister Leyden, which I have not seen. Only the codices of the earlier recension are therefore of any value for Lydgate's *Danse Macabre*. I shall print the Selden text of the poem, accompanying it by the French from a ms. of the Bibliothèque Communale at Lille, a codex now probably lost, as the municipal buildings of Lille were burned during the German occupation of that city.

Boston.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

#### A NOTE ON *Beowulf* 1600-1605

*Ða com non dæges; næs ofgeafon  
hwate Scyldingas; gewat him ham þonon  
gold-wine gumena. Gistas setan  
mōdes seoce, ond on mere stæredon;  
wiston ond ne wendon, þæt hie heora wine-drihten  
selfne gesawon.*

Successive generations of commentators have enveloped the last line and a half in a fog of conjecture and emendation. Many (e. g. Cosijn and Klaeber) insist that *wiston* must be rendered *wished*. Chambers, who takes this view, adds:

"To interpret *wiston* as 'knew' would necessitate a blending of two constructions: *wiston* would require *ne gesāwon*; *ne wēndon* requires *gesāwon* only. . . . Or we might assume that *ne* had dropped out after the *ne* of *selfne*—'they knew, and did not merely expect, that they should not see their lord himself again.' But this gives, after all, only a feeble sense. For why, in that case, did they wait?"

If one passes by this 'wilful ingenuity of blundering' and translates the words as they stand, without wrenching the meaning of *wiston* or emending the text, the sense is perfectly clear:

'They knew and did not merely expect, that they would see their lord himself again.'

The *ne wēndon* is merely the familiar epic idiom, repeating the sense of *wiston*—'they knew, it was not mere conjecture.' Such fullness of expression appears countless times in epic poetry.

Why should any *ne* be desired? The sense given would be indeed feeble. The Scyldings gave up hope and left; the followers of Beowulf had more confidence in their leader's prowess and waited for his return. They had, as we say, 'a feeling in their bones,' even though *mōdes seoce*. That such mixed feelings of hope and fear might exist together is shown in lines 2895-6.

Victoria College, Toronto.

J. D. BUSH.

## BRIEF MENTION

*The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination.* By Arthur Garfield Kennedy (Stanford University Publications, University Series: Language and Literature, vol. I, No. 1. Published by the University, 1920). The importance of the subject of this monograph is made strikingly clear by observations at the beginning (p. 8) and at the end (p. 49). It is observed that the editors of *Webster's Dictionary* and the editors of the *NED.* are free in using the verb-adverb combination "in defining other words." Thus, Webster, *cage* 'to shut up, or confine'; in the *NED.* *act 2* 'to bring into action, bring about.' "Not infrequently the editors of the *NED.* have utilized combinations in writing definitions which they have failed to define or illustrate in their proper places, which seems to show that some of our verb-adverb combinations are more necessary in the expression of ideas than scholars are willing to admit formally." Again (p. 49), "It is slightly amusing to find that, as in the case of the verb, the editors of *Webster's Dictionary* occasionally refuse official recognition to a combination-noun but let it slip in as part of a definition; which goes to show that the student of current tendencies is likely to be confronted not infrequently with the problem of classifying and defining a phrase which is rendering a definite service in language and yet has received no official recognition." With no trace of exaggeration these plain facts freshly invite the attention of the lexicographer and of the grammarian.

It is to be understood that, whereas the term 'verb-adverb compound' would accurately describe many of the combinations here considered, its use would require the drawing of a distinct line where no such line can be drawn, namely between true compounds and the looser combinations. The author has therefore adopted the comprehensive term 'verb-adverb combination,' which interprets his assumption that in the forms here studied "the verb and the combining particle" are united in greatly differing degrees of closeness. But there is no inexcusable evasion of a difficulty in this. Dr. Kennedy recognizes a true compound when the combining elements are fused into a symbol for the expression of a new meaning, a symbol in which the separate elements "have almost or altogether sacrificed their individual meanings." This new meaning can often be expressed by another word. Thus, *come by*, 'acquire'; *make out*, 'understand'; *put out*, 'extinguish.' "In other combinations, however, and by far the greatest number, the verb is modified in meaning by a certain weakly adverbial function of the particle but does not entirely merge its verbal personality in the combination. The particle, it is true, loses much of its usual adverbial or prepositional signification but in the combination assumes peculiar adverbial values, as, for example, in . . . *bottle up*, 'enclose in a bottle.' *button up*, 'fasten with buttons.' And in many others, finally, the usual values of verb and prepositional-

adverb remain fairly evident, as in *brush off, brush out, burn down, . . . hang up, leak out, . . . tack down.*" Evidently, as Dr. Kennedy observes, "this last group of combinations shades off so imperceptibly into the great mass of adverbial modifications such as *fly away, walk south, go home, etc.*, that it would be a hopeless undertaking to attempt to classify every verb-adverb combination as either close enough to be termed a verb-adverb compound, or loose enough to be called merely an adverbial modification."

That Dr. Kennedy has taken a sound grammatical view of his subject is made clear in the preceding paragraph. As a good workman he next advances from broad outlines to the determination of reasonable and effective limits for his immediate purpose. Accordingly he restricts "the material for the present study" to "combinations formed with the sixteen prepositional-adverbs *about, across, around (or round), at, by, down, for, in, off, on, out, over, thru, to, up, with.*" Moreover, there shall be no "thoroughgoing attempt to classify verb-adverb combinations as either acceptable English or as colloquial and slang," that is, to pronounce upon the "social status of each combination and usage."

The "Theory and History" of these combinations is the title of a section (pp. 11-18) that is suggestive but avowedly inconclusive as to both topics. Occurrences of the combination are reported for the early periods of the language (from Anglo-Saxon to Early Modern English), and hints are given of what the historian of the usage must consider. There has been a dying off of verbal compounds, and an "inrush of a multitude of Romanic verbs with inseparable prefixes" (p. 12), "which drove out the native compounds and for a time made the newer combination unnecessary" (p. 13); and to be reckoned with are the subtle manifestations of changes in the habitual fashion of native expression, the fashion or mood traceable in a growing preference for the figurative expression, for what is liberal rather than restrained, practical even plebeian rather than stiff and pedantic. The allurements of the subject in its historic aspects are strong, but Dr. Kennedy resists them, for he has in mind to be immediately and practically helpful to the teachers of rhetoric and composition, and to all who are intelligently caring for good English.

On the practical side of his subject Dr. Kennedy has proved himself to be well-poised in judgment. He has succeeded admirably in upholding the effective use of the 'combinations,' and in discerning in them the reflection of the most vital processes of usage; and he has equally well administered the needed caution against ignorant complacency, misdirected approval, and that abuse of the usage which is indicative of bad taste. A collation of several of the practical observations made under these heads will show that Dr. Kennedy has a clear perception of the right doctrine to be enforced. The 'compound' tends to become fixed in a figurative value and as "a linguistic fossil" (p. 14) is marked off from the

live 'combination,' which represents a process of formation that is actively maintained in every grade of usage, from slang to poetry. It is observed that "most speakers and writers who are attempting to effect contact with the poorly trained speaker of English will show numerous verb-abverb combinations of a colloquial or slangy character" (p. 17). Now two prominent objections stand out against an excessive use of 'combinations.' It is a mark of bad taste, perhaps of restricted power of expression, and often an indication of mental inertia, of laziness, to be limited by the exclusive use of, for example, the combination *to give in* in the figurative sense expressed by the neglected words 'submit, yield'; or to say habitually *give out*, neglecting the use of 'fail.' The second objection which is less formidable than the first, relates to the faulty logic of the redundant use of the prepositional-adverbs; "yet such redundancies as *bow down, fill up, hatch out*, have become so well entrenched in the language that one scarcely thinks it possible to use them otherwise" (p. 18). The purist may object to many combinations on the ground that the particle adds nothing to the meaning, but Dr. Kennedy believes "that the speaker almost always feels a nice distinction even tho his sense of the logical tells him that the particle should be quite unnecessary. The particle has been added in the first place to give emphasis, or perhaps to round out the speech-rhythm by the interpolation of a syllable; but once having done this, we proceed to acquire a feeling that the simple verb can not express quite what the compound does. So we say, for example, *add up, . . . bow down, . . . deal out, fold up, hatch out, . . . pile up, . . . taper off, wake up*," etc. (p. 28). Another group of verb-adverb combinations is accredited by long use to "special contexts." Thus, "*bid in*, according to Webster, implies that the present owner buys back his own property at auction; *bind out* usually applies to apprenticing; . . . we *call up* usually by telephone; one *crams up* for an examination; . . . *kick off* is a football term; . . . we still feel that *offer up* is suggestive of sacrifice" (p. 28).

Dr. Kennedy has collected a larger number of these combinations than he finds it 'practicable' to publish. He sees that he is dealing with "a changing, growing tendency in language which throws up overnight, as it were, new combinations, and new meanings, so that an absolute and complete list would be impossible" (p. 5). What he has therefore undertaken is a deduction from his extensive material, a consideration of selected groups of examples from which to reason out the linguistic principles of the usage. His modest hope is that his study "may prove suggestive to the average speaker of English and may even lead some to a more thoughtful use of these combinations" (p. 6). But many a serious and even technical student of the language will be ready to confess that Dr. Kennedy has led him to see in this subject principles of unsuspected importance.

How the selected prepositional-adverbs 'combine' in present day



usage is shown in a section that gives an insight into the problem. This is offered as a general statement, that in 'combination' the particle may keep its independent meaning unchanged; or it may take on a meaning not associated with it when used separately; or it may be "so merged with the verb that it seems no longer to have an independent value" (p. 19). Thus, one distinguishes the literal use of *out* in combinations like *hand out*, *spread out*, from the more figurative use in *carry out*, 'complete,' and from the third use in *make out*, 'comprehend,' *give out*, 'fail,' *try out*, 'make a trial of,' in which the verb and the particle are fused to express a meaning not obviously suggested by either. This three-fold division of course merely marks the high-points of difference in long series of overlapping meanings. The prepositional-adverbs considered in this chapter with respect to their values as 'combining' particles vary greatly in frequency of combination. The particle *up* is the most frequent, and has the widest "range of meanings in combination." Next in frequency is the particle *out*, which however enters into less than half as many combinations. The remaining particles of the list fall far below these two in frequency. This supremacy of *up* and *out* points significantly to a characteristic aspect of creative and figurative tendencies in the usage.

Four general categories of 'syntactical effects of combination' are pointed out (pp. 26-27): (1) an intransitive verb may be a member of a transitive combination, as in *come by*, 'acquire'; (2) conversely an intransitive combination may result from the association of the particle with a transitive verb, as in *cheer up*, *get about*; (3) the combination may require a different object from that of the simple verb, as shown by contrasting '*argue a case*' with '*argue down an opponent*'; (4) some combinations have the "significance or connotation of a passive verb," thus, "a piece of cloth will *make up* nicely, . . . a plan *works out* well." Dr. Kennedy has here suggested a grammatical subject, abounding in fine distinctions, that would reward a more complete investigation. So too under the heading "Peculiarities of Combination" there are problems in grammar and rhetoric introduced to the student of the language in an admirable and striking manner. The word 'introduced' is to enter the charge of a deficiency against the school-manuals. Deep lessons relating to the inherent character of the language are to be learned by considering the laws of sentence-stress and the rhythmic principles involved in the use of these combinations, and by observing in them the relation of native to non-Teutonic words.

It is the last of the suggested problems that is the most profoundly important. Some of the easily observed facts that have a deep historical and linguistically philosophic meaning are described and illustrated by Dr. Kennedy. He observes that the average speaker finds it easier to say *keep on* than always to have in mind for ready use the foreign equivalent *continue*; so with *put out* and *extinguish*; *use up* and *exhaust*. And then a list is added which includes *get on*, 'prosper'; *let down*, 'relax'; *pull out*, 'depart,'

with the observation that these combinations represent the usage of the indifferent speaker, in distinction from the "average man of fairly good education," who will usually employ the simple verbs. As to the speaker, however, a further distinction is to be made: "Many a college professor or other public speaker uses the combination in his ordinary conversation, and even in lecturing, but shifts to a more formal, less colloquial, vocabulary the moment he begins to write" (p. 39). Dr. Kennedy will not be misunderstood at this point, for he has properly insisted on the legitimate use of combinations and on the significant fact that this usage represents a vital and creative force in the language.

The legitimate vitality of this combining-process invites the attention of the historic and philosophic grammarian. He will, of course, not overlook the subtleties involved in distinguishing a true verbal compound from a merely syntactical combination of 'particle' and verb,—an aspect of the subject that for German has been well discussed by Professor von Jagemann (*MLN*, v, 1 ff., 1890); but he will be more attentive to that other aspect of the problem which for English has a special importance that is not easily over-estimated. This concerns the peculiar facts and consequences of the history of the language since the Norman Conquest.

In adopting Romanic elements the language has maintained, with temporary compromises, the essentials of its Germanic character. This is shown in a striking manner in the accentuation of substantive and verbal compounds. The native prefixes had become an impoverished category when English was vastly enriched by the varied list brought in from Romanic sources. Pairs of compounds like *abstract*: *abstráct*, *subject*: *subjéct*, etc., represent not only the reënforcement of the vocabulary by words compounded with significant prefixes, but also the perpetuation of native principles of word-accentuation. This observation brings one close to a view of the particular influences to be considered in the development of the use of 'combinations' as here designated. Aside from its influence and aid in the expansion and articulation of thought,—a subject that remains to be competently studied,—the foreign vocabulary has doubled the means of expression, resulting in two types of style, of which the one may be symbolized by the exclusive use of forms like *get round*, the other by the preferred use of forms like *circumvent*. The infinite degrees of the blending of these extreme styles contribute to the unmatched resourcefulness of the language. The point to be observed in this connection is however this, that no variety of the polysyllabic style, however 'Johnsonian' it may be, totally obscures the fact that the foreign 'compounds' have not overcome but have, on the contrary, greatly stimulated the continuous formation and the increasing use of the synonymous 'combinations' of native elements, which conserve the native sentence-stress and protect the monosyllabic character of the language against an excess in yielding to the foreign pattern.

J. W. B.